

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU

Faculty of Social Sciences

School of Economics and Business Administration

Syed Muhammad Mazhar Bukhari

LEADER'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR AND COLLECTIVISTIC
LEADERSHIP: HOW LEADERS CREATE SELF-MANAGEMENT

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Kurmet Kivipõld

Tartu 2025

Abstract

This paper aims to investigate the interplay between authentic, transformational, and transactional leadership behaviours in enabling organisational self-management via Organisational Leadership Capability (OLC). Employing a quantitative approach, the dataset is composed of 1,079 Estonian conscripts, applying valid measures to operationalise both leadership styles and OLC dimensions (Alignment and Cohesion, Control-Feedback Systems, Architecture of Internal Networks). The results demonstrated that authentic leadership as a favourable behaviour increased relational transparency and trust, transformational leadership uniquely influences intellectual stimulation and strategic vision alignment, and transactional leadership consistently favoured structured accountability and clarity. Importantly, this research was focused on the integrated impact of these leadership behaviours to effectively support self-management while ensuring teams' dynamics and cohesive behaviours. The practical implications provide insights for organisational leadership programs and recommendations for structural alignment supporting self-management.

I have written this Master's Thesis independently. Any ideas or data taken from other authors or other sources have been fully referenced.

Table of contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Abstract..... | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 4 |
| 2. Literature Review..... | 6 |
| 2.1. Self-Management in Organisational Leadership context..... | 6 |
| 2.2. Leaders' Behaviours | 11 |
| 3. Methodology | 19 |
| 4. Results..... | 22 |
| Conclusion & Discussion..... | 25 |
| List of references..... | 28 |
| Resümee..... | 33 |

Introduction

Research on leadership has consistently emphasised its key role in organisational effectiveness and various literature bases have examined distinct leadership behaviours and their connection to organisational performance and team behaviours. Authentic leadership, transformational leadership, and transactional leadership are prominently studied due to their substantial empirical evidence and theoretical distinction (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Banks et al., 2016; Young et al., 2021). The three leadership frameworks present distinct relational, motivational, and structural influences within organisational contexts, thus providing a solid foundation to study and analyse self-management practices. Authentic leadership's conceptual foundations highlight the values of transparency, ethical standards, and self-awareness, enhancing trust and psychological safety within teams (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Transformational theory presents an emphasis on inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation, effectively promoting teams to be adaptable and focus on continuous learning amongst each other (Jun & Lee, 2023). While, transactional leadership is reliant on contingent rewards and structured performance management, aiming for clarity, accountability and operational efficiency (Abbas & Ali, 2021; Young et al., 2021). Although examined independently, the current literature is inadequate to provide a deep understanding of how they collectively facilitate organisational self-management, especially through the mediation of organisational leadership capability (OLC). The main concepts relevant to this research include authentic leadership, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organisational leadership capability (OLC), collectivistic leadership, and self-management. Self-management is described as the teams' capability to autonomously manage responsibilities and decisions without direct supervision by top management, as responsibilities are shared and decisions-making is distributed (Bolden, 2011; Lee & Edmondson, 2017). Collectivistic leadership involves distributed responsibilities, mutual influence, and collective decision-making, therefore embedding leadership within daily team interactions and shared norms (Kummelstedt, 2023; Schell & Bischof, 2021). OLC is a systematic approach promoting scalability and alignment of shared leadership practices with organisational objectives (Kivipõld & Vadi, 2010).

This research presents critical insights that are relevant to organisations aiming to transition towards more agile, self-managed structures. The empirical evidence can guide organisational leaders with desirable leadership behaviours, designing leadership training

programs, and implementing systemic structures that ensure both autonomy and cohesive team dynamics. The primary aim of this research is to determine how together, authentic, transformational, and transactional leadership behaviours foster organisational self-management, within the context of organisational leadership. The literature review reveals a critical and in-depth insight into the three leadership behaviours or styles, each portraying unique strengths and intrinsic limitations in organisational contexts. Despite extensive theoretical exploration and empirical validation in various domains, existing scholarly literature does not provide adequate guidance on the specific manner in which these distinct leadership styles influence the practical development and effectiveness of self-management practices. Thus, this study seeks to address and bridge this gap by providing practical insights and guidance, critical for organisations striving to effectively promote self-management and adapt to the evolving dynamics of modern workplaces.

This research study intended to achieve this purpose, by employing a quantitative design, collecting data from 1,079 Estonian military conscripts with validated instruments measuring various dimensions of authentic, transformational, and transactional leadership and their relationship with OLC. The analysis includes descriptive statistics and regression models that develop an understanding of how leadership behaviours distinctly impact the components of organisational leadership capability. Overall, the study indicates that authentic leadership significantly influences relational trust and transparency; transformational leadership predominantly influences through vision alignment and intellectual stimulation; and transactional leadership consistently reinforces clarity and structured accountability. These findings highlight that integrating all three dimensions of leadership behaviours to support effective self-management practices in organisations is paramount. The structure of the thesis is outlined as follows. Literature review presents an in-depth review of available research, defining self-management, collectivistic leadership, OLC, and the three leadership behaviours in question. The methodology section is detailed and covers the quantitative research design, the instruments used, and the characteristics of the participants. The empirical results provide evidence supporting the distinct contributions of each leadership style. The thesis concludes with a discussion that summarises new understandings, practical implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

Keywords: Leadership Behaviour, Self-management, Collectivistic Leadership, Organisational Leadership Capability (OLC), Authentic Leadership, Transformational

Leadership, Transactional Leadership. **Research classification code (CERCS):** S189
Organizational science.

2. Literature Review

This literature review is structured into two main sections, including a Team and Leader section. Each section addressing the critical aspects of leadership and self-management within organisations. The rationale for this division stems from the need to understand different concepts from the perspective of a team and leadership position respectively, including the different concepts that will be explored and explained. The Team section explores the concept and understanding of self-management, focusing on how teams operate autonomously, and the challenges associated with implementing self-managed structures, a sub-part of it is collectivistic leadership, emphasising shared responsibilities and decentralised decision-making. Moreover, a sub-part of collectivistic leadership and in turn a part of self-management is organisational leadership capability (OLC), which make sures the leadership is scalable and aligned with organisational objectives. On the other hand, the Leader section examines what are different leadership behaviours – Authentic, Transformational and Transactional Leadership and how they impact self-management. By following this structure, the literature review will provide a comprehensive and complete view of different concepts, including self-management and considering both team-based dynamics and leadership-driven influences. Additionally, offering insights into the conditions that enable successful self-managed organisations.

2.1. Self-Management in Organisational Leadership context

Self-management

Self-management within organisations is an operational and leadership approach where employees autonomously manage tasks, responsibilities, and decision-making without continuous hierarchical supervision. Grounded in decentralisation principles, self-management enhances organisational agility, innovation and efficiency by empowering employees at all levels (Lee & Edmondson, 2017). At its core, self-management allows individuals and teams to have ownership of their work, set their own goals and make decisions that directly impact performance and outcomes (Gronn, 2002). Research has

identified that organisations where self-management is practiced experience higher employee engagement, motivation and stronger team cohesion (Bolden, 2011). Unlike traditional hierarchical models, where leaders dictate responsibilities, self-management distributes the power of decision-making across employees, enabling them to handle tasks based on competency and situation. Case studies of firms like Buurtzorg, Valve and Morning Star demonstrate how decentralised leadership fosters creativity, responsiveness and overall performance. (Martela & Nandram, 2025).

Transitioning to self-management requires organisations to create enabling conditions that support autonomy and decentralised decision-making. Several organisational conditions facilitate self-management, such as (Lee & Edmondson, 2017; DeRue, 2011; Bolden, 2011; Burke et al., 2006):

- **Transparent Communication Channels:** Instantaneous access to information for independent informed decision-making.
- **Supportive Leadership Culture:** Leaders acting as enablers instead of controllers, guiding teams and avoiding micromanagement.
- **Flexible Work Structures:** These promote autonomy over schedules, tasks and priorities, which avoids burnout, nurturing productivity and fuelling innovation.

These organisational conditions work alongside behavioural frameworks to build self-managing teams capable of high performance, particularly in environments that demand agility, adaptability and are innovation centric (Edmondson, 1999).

Structurally, self-management reflects a redesign of organisational authority and workflow. Traditional bureaucratic structures or layers are replaced with decentralised teams capable of independent decision making and developing internal accountability mechanisms. Such teams become microcosms of the organisation, where members share leadership, management functions, and self-regulative processes. On the other hand, from a team function standpoint, this model shifts focus from managerial control to team-based coordination and collective mutual accountability (CARSON et al., 2007). However, the implementation of self-management is not without challenges. Teams along with leaders, may often experience resistance based on deep-seated cultural norms or comfort with

hierarchy. When transitioning from traditional structures, common challenges such as, role ambiguity, coordination difficulties and accountability gaps may surface. Establishing self-managed systems may experience hindrance without prior cultural foundations in trust, open and transparent communication, and a sense of collective ownership (Gronn, 2002; Bolden, 2011; Edmondson, 1999; Nicolaides et al., 2014). Viewed through this lens, collectivistic leadership can be thought of as a subsystem within self-management. It dispenses influence in the same way self-management dispenses control, ensuring that autonomy is grounded in collective responsibility and shared accountability. This integration supports high-performing, self-regulated teams and sets that stage for the next structural layer: organisational leadership capability. This will be covered later in the literature review. This nested structure forms the thesis's conceptual foundation for understanding how leadership behaviours contribute to self-managed organisations.

Collectivistic Leadership

Collectivistic leadership has gained more significance as firms transition from hierarchical models to decentralised leadership models or structures (Kummelstedt, 2023). Compared to hierarchical models of leadership emphasising individual authority and decision-making capability, collectivistic leadership is characterized by distributed responsibilities, mutual influence, and shared or collective decision-making among team members. The leadership style is commonly associated with self-managing organisations (SMOs), where teams operate under minimal hierarchical control or intervention (Schell & Bischof, 2021). Empirical evidence affirms that collectivistic leadership is more than just the absence of hierarchy but rather a conscious and intentional redistribution of leadership duties that enables teams to collectively manage and lead themselves (Martela, 2019). According to (Yammarino et al., 2012), collectivistic leadership is conceived as a distinct leadership phenomenon that revolves around the collective “we” rather than the individual “I”, changing the traditional hierarchical leadership understanding and moving towards a more inclusive, distributed leadership approach within organisations. Collectivistic leadership embraces the idea that leadership activities and responsibilities can and should be distributed across multiple individuals, involving teams and organisation as a whole. Which results in leveraging various perspectives and capabilities within organisational teams (Ziegert et al., 2021). Another core belief of collectivistic leadership suggests that leadership represents an emergent, relational process by which multiple team members mutually influence each other,

additionally, sharing leadership functions through ongoing interactions, social exchange, and interdependence (Yammarino et al., 2012; Ziegert et al., 2021). Kummelstedt (2023) asserts that collectivistic leadership significantly differentiates itself from hierarchical leadership by emphasising mutual transformation and reciprocal adaptation within team members rather than relying on unilateral authority figure. Furthermore, the author suggests that collectivistic leadership acknowledges and accepts competence hierarchies that naturally exist or arise due to informational, experiential or cognitive differences, hence, it does not promote a naïve egalitarianism rather a balanced approach simultaneously recognising situational competence and expertise within different groups and their members.

Essentially, collectivistic leadership moves beyond the standard norm of having an individualistic view of a leader, viewing them as singular heroes or authoritative figure. Instead, it visualises leadership as dynamic, interactive process deeply embedded within collective structures, relationships, and roles. High mutual trust, social inclusion and clearly articulated collective visions are crucial for its successful implementation and as a result it ensures organisational effectiveness and long-term adaptability (Yammarino et al., 2012; Ziegert et al., 2021; Kummelstedt, 2023). Building on the behavioural roots of collectivistic leadership, organisations must have the structural capacity to sustain and grow shared leadership practices across teams. While collectivistic leadership encourages mutual accountability and distributed influence on a team level, its long-term effectiveness is dependent on deeper organisational systems that support, embed and replicate these behaviours throughout the organisation. This is where Organisational Leadership Capability (OLC) becomes critical. In essence, it is a subsystem of collectivistic leadership, offering the institutional infrastructure through culture, processes and development mechanisms. This allows for collectivistic leadership to exist and thrive beyond teams, ensuring the principles of shared leadership are not only embraced but systemically reinforced. Thus, allowing organisations to connect distributed leadership behaviours with strategic goals and long-term adaptability.

Organisational Leadership Capability (OLC) acts as the foundational framework that facilitates the flourishing of collectivistic leadership beyond the confines of individual teams. While collectivistic leadership embodies the practice of shared influence, OLC guarantees that this form of leadership is integrated, scalable, and aligned with organisational objectives. It is characterised as the organisation's capacity to develop, sustain, and adapt leadership

behaviours at all levels, functioning as a meta-capability that systematically promotes the development and reinforcement of distributed leadership practices (Kivipõld & Vadi, 2010). One of the key variables of OLC is **Alignment and Cohesion**, which represents the organisation's ability to synchronise strategic goals with internal values and team behaviours. This variable ensures that leadership activities are in-line with the broader mission and culture, enhancing consistency across teams and reinforcing a unified direction. In high-alignment environments, people are more likely to lead proactively and drive collective objectives (Kivipõld, 2015). The second core variable, **Control-Feedback System**, refers to the mechanisms that enable the organisation to monitor progress, receive feedback, and adjust internal processes in real-time. This control-feedback loop system encourages continuous learning, accountability, and adaptive reaction to environmental fluctuations. In rapidly changing conditions, an effective and robust feedback system allows teams to self-correct and evolve, reinforcing the principles of distributed leadership further (Kivipõld & Vadi, 2013). The third and most structural elements of OLC is the **Architecture of the Internal Network**. This pertains to the configuration of relationships, information flows, and communication channels that support collective decision-making. A robust internal network architecture fosters knowledge sharing, minimizes departmental silos, and allows for organic emergence of leadership across various teams and functions. It is through this internal architecture that collectivistic leadership becomes operational and sustainable at the organisation level (Kivipõld & Vadi, 2010).

Collectively, the three behavioural elements; alignment and cohesion, control-feedback system, and architecture of internal network, constitute the structural foundation of the OLC. As an element of collectivistic leadership, the OLC not only promotes distributed leadership but also systematically strengthens it. This capability allows organisations to integrate decentralised leadership behaviours, making them the resilient, scalable and strategically aligned across the entire organisation. In conclusion, self-management, collectivistic leadership and OLC together constitute as an interlinked conceptual framework, highlighting the importance of distributed leadership responsibilities and decision-making within organisations. The dynamic variety of literature included provides a holistic and comprehensive conceptual understanding of these topics and aligns directly with the study aim and research question. This is achieved particularly through illustrating the existing depth of studies on these topics and how collectivistic leadership being a subpart of self-management and OLC being a subpart of collectivistic leadership and essentially self-

management as well – contribute to promote self-management through its mechanisms or aforementioned variables.

2.2. Leaders' Behaviours

Authentic Leadership

Authentic Leadership is characterised by many traits such as transparency, ethical behaviour, self-awareness, and balanced decision-making, which enable and promote sincere and genuine relationships between leaders and followers (Walumbwa et al., 2008). At its core, authentic leadership involves leaders consistently acting in accordance with deeply held personal values, in turn creating a transparent, ethical and inclusive organisational culture. (Walumbwa et al., 2008) highlights that authenticity goes beyond simple adherence of leaders to values; rather it is about how leaders internalise and visibly demonstrate these fundamental values, which positively helps in influencing team dynamics and driving organisational coherence and trust. Empirical research has repeatedly confirmed the benefits of authentic leadership in organisational settings, especially in areas related to employee satisfaction, psychological health, and organisational commitment. As argued by (Banks et al., 2016), authentic leaders can significantly increase and impact the development of trust, motivation and overall performance among subordinates. Authentic leaders ensure their employees feel valued, understood and empowered to perform their best, through promoting environments built upon openness and psychological safety. The meta-analysis reveals such leadership style to be particularly effective in contexts that demand high ethical standards, adaptability to change, and management of uncertainty. Authentic leaders' steady behaviour and transparent communication reduce ambiguity, thus allowing teams to function effectively and confidently amid complex environments (Banks et al., 2016).

One of the key theoretical frameworks underpinning authentic leadership includes four primary components. **Self-awareness** refers to leaders having a clear, reflective understanding of their strengths and weaknesses, emotions, and values, enabling them to lead with credibility and authenticity. **Relational transparency** includes the practice of openly sharing thoughts, emotions, and rationale underlying their decisions, thus fostering mutual trust, respect and effective collaboration within teams. Fairness, inclusivity and respect for diverse perspectives or viewpoints is ensured through **balanced processing** which

emphasises the need for leaders to objectively and impartially consider all relevant information and perspectives before making decisions. Lastly, the **internalised moral perspective** accentuates the leaders consistently act in accordance with deeply ingrained ethical values, regardless of external pressures or expectation, thus entrenching organisational integrity (Walumbwa et al., 2008). The Extended Authentic Leadership Model (EALM) introduced by (Meerits et al., 2021), distinctly categorises the components in intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies. Where intrapersonal competencies refer to the internal attributes and self-management skills of a leader, including **self-awareness**, **ethical regulation** (maintaining and upholding moral standards and ethical decision making) and **self-regulation** (effectively managing and controlling one's emotions, impulses, and responses under pressure). While interpersonal competencies pertain to focus on leaders' relational abilities and include **relational transparency** and **balanced processing**. The EALM model theoretical framework is inspired by (Walumbwa et al., 2008) and (Beddoes-Jones & Swailes, 2015), both have enriched the model, and this interlinkage plays a critical role in understanding Authentic Leadership as a concept and its implementation.

Studies done in healthcare further signify the evidence of authentic leadership's practical benefits. Authentic leadership was found to significantly impact critical health team outcomes, including improved patient satisfaction, increased staff engagement, and reduced levels of burnout among healthcare professionals. Such leadership practices in healthcare resulted in increased employee retention and a stronger sense of organisational identity among healthcare workers. These findings demonstrate the transformative potential of authentic leadership to enable healthier and more resilient workplace cultures along with sustainable performance improvements in critical service sectors (Alilyyani et al., 2018). Despite the solid body of research on authentic leadership, there remain notable gaps regarding the aspects influencing its effectiveness across variety of contexts. Current research stresses the importance of deeper exploration and examination into how authentic leadership practices vary across different organisational environments, cultures, and leadership hierarchies. Further research and understanding could enable how to leverage authentic leadership in various organisational settings (Gardner et al., 2011).

Overall, authentic leadership emerges as a robust leadership framework that influences organisational environments by promoting transparency, ethical standards, and employee wellbeing. Empirical research universally demonstrates its benefits, including

enhanced trust, employee engagement, improved psychological health, and sustained organisational effectiveness. Authentic leaders have the capacity to align their actions with core personal values, thus promoting environments of open communication, collaboration, and ethical integrity. Consequently, authentic leadership plays a significant role in organisational resilience, flexibility and adaptability, and sustainable performance, making it an essential leadership practice for organisations seeking sustainable long-term success (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Banks et al., 2016; Alilyyani et al., 2018; Gardner et al., 2011).

Transformational leadership

Transformational leadership is characterised by leaders who motivate their followers to transcend their personal interests in favour of collective organisational goals. Such leadership style often brings about deep changes in values, attitudes and behaviours of followers, thus encouraging exceptional performance and commitment. One of the key concepts of transformational leadership is grounded in four core dimensions, collectively known as the “Four I’s”. Each dimension contributing uniquely to create the basis of transformative organisational environments (Banks et al., 2016; Walumbwa et al., 2007).

Idealised influence pertains to leaders exhibiting inspirational qualities such as ethical conduct, moral standards, and integrity, hence becoming role models that earn trust and admiration among followers. Such ethical leadership promotes employees to emulate these behaviours, in return reinforcing organisational integrity and fostering a cohesive ethical culture (Lin et al., 2020). **Inspirational motivation** as the name suggests involves clearly articulating a compelling organisational vision, igniting enthusiasm and aligning employees towards a collective goal. Transformational leaders generate excitement and commitment through effective communication and passion, directly influencing team cohesion and sustained performance (Chua & Ayoko, 2019). **Intellectual stimulation** refers to the method through which leaders encourage innovative thinking and challenge conventional norms, enabling teams to address challenges creatively and effectively. Moreover, leaders prompt followers to reassess current practices, creating a culture of continuous learning and adaptability essential in dynamic environments. **Individualised consideration** involves leaders providing catered and personalised support, mentoring and attention as per individual followers’ needs, subsequently recognising their unique strengths and facilitating personal and professional development. The personalised attention solidifies

relational bonds and enhances employees' engagement and organisational commitment (Chua & Ayoko, 2019; Jun & Lee, 2023).

Transformational leadership as conceptualised by Podsakoff et al. (1990) involves behaviours to inspire followers surpass or transcend self-interest for the interests of the organisation. These leaders motivate followers by connecting individuals to shared values and overall organisational goals, thus enabling them to perform beyond basic expectations. The same study (Podsakoff et al., 1990), also highlighted six key behaviours which are similar and inspired by the aforementioned "Four I's". The six key Transformational Leader Behaviours are **Identifying and Articulating a Vision** – this pertains to leaders clearly communicating a compelling future vision to inspire and motivate employees while identifying opportunities. **Providing an Appropriate Model** – here leaders lead by example with extension demonstrating exemplary behaviours and embodying values that followers would be encouraged to imitate. **Fostering the Acceptance of Group Goals** – leaders promote cooperation towards achieving shared organisational goals. **High Performance Expectations** – leaders set and communicate high standards and expectations for excellence and performance, encouraging followers to excel. **Providing Individualised Support** – genuine care, respect, and attention to personal and emotional needs of followers is provided by leaders. **Intellectual Stimulation** – leaders encourage challenging the traditional norms and practices, hence, promoting innovation. The comparison of both concepts provides a holistic understanding of how each framework compliments Transformational Leadership Behaviour's understanding and with the implementation of this leadership style.

The positive impacts of transformational leadership on organisational outcomes such as innovation, employee engagement and overall performance are all supported by extensive empirical research. Transformational leadership has been empirically validated as the most essential element to facilitate employee innovation, particularly through fostering commitment to organisational change. Leaders enacting these practices actively nurture creative environments, resulting in sustained organisational flexibility and competitive edge (Jun & Lee, 2023). Transformational leadership significantly enhances employee engagement by fulfilling psychological and intrinsic motivational needs. Employees under this leadership style tend to report higher intrinsic motivation and productivity, driven by their sense of competence, autonomy and relatedness. Such enhanced engagement is particularly valuable in high-performance industries, with direct influence on organisational effectiveness and

profitability (Chua & Ayoko, 2019). Furthermore, this leadership style positively influences organisational performance by strengthening effective organisational commitment and job satisfaction. Followers of such leadership generally develop deeper emotional bonds with their organisation, translating to greater discretionary effort and heightened individual and collective performance. Personalised attention and consistent inspirational messaging help in reinforcing the deep emotional ties, which further highlights the imperative role of transformational leadership in sustained organisational success (Jiatong et al., 2022).

Apart from organisational performance, transformational leadership significantly improves employee psychological well-being, notably reducing stress and burnout. Studies indicate leaders adopting this style cultivate supporting and empowering work environments that mitigate stressors, improving overall employee health and workplace satisfaction. Organisations adopting transformational leadership strategies report healthier and content employees, contributing to lower turnover rates and increased retention (Kim & Cruz, 2022). The practical efficacy of transformational leadership is evident across diverse sectors, demonstrating its versatility and adaptability. In education sector, it improves teachers' commitment by promoting collaborative and supportive school cultures. Principals demonstrating behaviours, such as mentoring, vision articulation and collaborative engagement, develop professional commitment and institutional loyalty in teachers, thereby enhancing educational quality, experience and institutional effectiveness (Kareem et al., 2023). In public sector, transformational leadership proves to be highly effective especially during periods of crises, positively impacting employee morale, satisfaction, and organisational resilience. During the COVID-19 pandemic, government entities embracing such leadership strategies maintained heightened stability and employee morale. During crises, cultivated cooperation and trust-based climates are essential to navigate through uncertainty, thereby this leadership style is a perfect fit with effective clear communication, compelling vision, along with emotional and professional support (Almohtaseb et al., 2021).

In conclusion, transformational leadership plays a significant role in influencing organisational success across multiple dimensions, including innovation, employee engagement, improved productivity and psychological well-being. Through the frameworks whether its the four dimensions "Four I's" or the six key behaviours, they profoundly impact organisational cultures and employee behaviours. Much research across various sectors

consistently confirms its effectiveness, establishing it as a fundamental strategy and model to sustainable organisational growth, resilience and competitive advantage.

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership, as the name suggests, is distinctly characterised through transactions between leaders and their subordinates, where performance is closely tied to pre-determined rewards and penalties. The model is grounded in well-defined and structured interactions, primarily based on clearly defined roles, specific tasks and measurable outcomes. Leaders following this method set clear expectations, reward adherence, and take prompt corrective actions to mitigate deviations. Transactional leadership model according to one approach, functions on two essential mechanisms: contingent rewards and active management-by-exception, both designed to maintain sustained productivity and adherence to procedures (Young et al., 2021). The theoretical basis for this leadership style is essentially based on social exchange theory, suggesting that interactions and behaviours between leaders and their followers is dictated by mutual expectations and reciprocal obligations. Transactional leaders provide rewards to followers on the achievement of set goals, thus establishing predictability and stability within organisations. Additionally, it is delineated clearly from transformation leadership by emphasising structured, exchange-based interactions rather than relying on inspirational or motivational tactics (Garger et al., 2023).

As discussed earlier, transactional leadership operates through two critical dimensions: contingent reward and active management-by-exception. The explicit outlining of tasks, behaviours and outcomes, while directly linking rewards to meeting those defined expectations by leaders, is known as the contingent reward. Active management-by-exception entails closely monitoring of employee performance, with immediate corrective actions being taken if deviations from set standards are detected. Through utilising these dimensions, transactional leadership encourages efficiency, discipline and adherence to established organisational standards (Abbas & Ali, 2021). However, transactional leadership as defined by Podsakoff et al. (1984) is a systemised exchange process between followers and leaders, where leader behaviour depends on the followers' performance. This leadership style primarily revolves around contingent and non-contingent reward and punishment behaviours. According to Podsakoff et al. (1984), **contingent reward** refers to leaders delivering rewards such as recognition and praise based on achievement of high performance. Similarly,

contingent punishment is administered by leaders through punitive actions or expressing disapproval specifically in response to poor performance. Moreover, **noncontingent reward** pertains to leaders providing rewards indiscriminately, regardless of performance outcomes. Likewise, **noncontingent punishment** is the impose of punishment irrespective of actual performance levels. In conclusion, the difference between the studies highlighted above provide a clearer picture and understanding of the Transactional Leadership Behaviour and its implementation through those frameworks, additionally, there are clear similarities in different studies as well.

Empirical studies support the effectiveness of transactional leadership in a variety of organisational contexts, especially in environments requiring clarity, structured order and adherence to specified procedures. This leadership style demonstrates considerable importance in academic setting, through clear expectations and frequent feedback. Research findings highlight the positive impacts within academic context by encouraging reliable and structured outcomes. However, researchers caution against overdependence on exclusive transactional practices, without integrating transformational elements, resulting in limited student engagement and intrinsic motivation (Garger et al., 2023). Research uncovers the multifaceted effects of transactional leadership on follower performance. Contingent reward-based practices demonstrate positive influence on quality of leader-member relationships, enhancing employee performance. Nonetheless, overly stringent monitoring and incentive, much like micromanagement, might inadvertently suppress employee motivation and psychological empowerment. Consequently, the research calls for a balanced transactional leadership approach, effective in contexts demanding high accountability and clearly defined results (Young et al., 2021). Transactional leadership significantly impacts various organisational settings, inclusive of employee engagement and project management amongst other contexts. The model's ability to set clear expectations, explicit goals, timely rewards and structured feedback mechanisms, all while fostering organisational efficiency, compliance and predictable outcomes are particularly beneficial in structured environments and high power-distance cultures. However, solely relying on transactional leadership, as discussed earlier may hinder employee engagement, creativity and adaptability. Researchers suggest integrating transactional practices with other leadership styles or elements of it to fully leverage organisational efficiency and effectiveness, encouraging a culture of motivation and innovation across diverse settings (Blomme et al., 2015; Abbas & Ali, 2021).

Additionally, transactional leadership represents a consequential role in shaping knowledge-sharing behaviours within organisations. Transactional leaders define knowledge-sharing expectations in clear and explicit terms and align incentives contingent on expected knowledge-sharing behaviour and actions in a direct way. This structured approach enhances information dissemination, knowledge application and utilisation, and the overall intellectual capital of the organisation better. However, the research clearly highlights that overdependence on this leadership style can limit voluntary knowledge-sharing efforts, suggesting the necessity of incorporating relational and motivational leadership concepts (Khoshnaw & Karadas, 2024). In summary, transactional leadership is a structured and pragmatic approach that emphasises clear exchanges between leaders and subordinates with explicit rewards and corrective mechanisms to ensure maintained compliance and organisational efficiency. Empirical evidence across education, project management and knowledge-intensive settings consistently highlight the crucial effectiveness of transactional leadership for developing structured, predictable outcomes and promoting organisational discipline. Nevertheless, researchers remain concerned and cautious about its limitations in fostering intrinsic motivation, empowerment and deeper employee engagement. In light of these findings, therefore, organizations targeting the integration of transactional leadership are encouraged to merge with transformational or other leadership styles. Thereby, leveraging structured accountability alongside motivational and inspirational leadership dimensions to achieve a more balanced and sustainable organisational success.

This thesis focuses on Authentic, Transformational, and Transactional leadership, due to these three paradigms being most prominent, empirically supported, and theoretically distinguished frameworks within organisational behaviour literature. Each of these approaches has a unique orientation in behavioural; relational, developmental, and structural; which is critical for understanding how leaders influence the emergence and sustainability of self-management. These varied empirical distinction between the approaches is examined in the results section through their differentiated impact on the three dimensions of Organisational Leadership Capability (OLC).

Research Question

The importance and impact of different leadership styles and attributes of authentic, transformational, and transactional have been explored in studies before alongside their

benefits. It's essential to explore how their unique attributes collectively foster self-management in context of organisational leadership. Although, there is extensive theoretical discussions and empirical validations highlighting the strengths of these leadership styles individually, however, their combined implementation and application is less understood. This study aims to address this gap by investigating how these leadership behaviours, when applied collectively or simultaneously within organisational context, contribute to the promotion and enabling of self-management. Hence, the central research question guiding this thesis is:

“How do leaders’ authentic, transformational, and transactional leadership behaviours promote the development of self-management in context of organisational leadership?”

Exploring this question is of significant theoretical and practical importance. It aims to clarify which leadership practices organisations can integrate and leverage to foster robust self-management capabilities. Furthermore, findings from this research have the potential to enhance organisational resilience, innovation and adaptability through delivering leaders with insights into the effective blend of motivational, relational and structured leadership dimensions effectively.

3. Methodology

Research Design

This study uses a quantitative research design, based on a correlational approach to examine the relationship between leadership behaviours (authentic, transformational, and transactional) and the development of self-management, mediated through the concept of organisational leadership capability (OLC). The research question was used as the main guiding factor. A quantitative approach is considered most suitable for this research due to its effectiveness in evaluating this research question, establishing statistical associations, and enabling generalisable insights. Unlike qualitative or mixed methods, the quantitative method allows for the measurement of latent leadership constructs through validates scales and facilitates the modelling of interactions between leadership behaviours and organisational systems. Previous research based on similar leadership constructs have successfully utilised survey-based quantitative methods, further justifying their use in this context (Kivipõld &

Vadi, 2010; Kivipõld, 2015). The dataset consists of responses from 1,079 conscripts undergoing mandatory military service in Estonia. The military environment presents a distinctive high-pressure and structured setting where emerging decentralised leadership tendencies can be observed, even within traditionally hierarchical system. This context offers a valuable opportunity to explore the subtle effects of leadership behaviours on organisational transformation. The participants were predominantly male (97.9%), with an average age of 20.7 years ($SD = 1.5$), and their service duration ranged from 8 to 11 months. The sampling method employed was purposive, targeting a specific population where leadership behaviours could be critically examined under structured stress. Although this may limit the generalisability to traditional civilian organisations, it enhances internal validity by ensuring consistency in hierarchical structures and exposure to similar leadership structures. Such trade-offs are frequently encountered in organisational leadership research conducted within institutional settings (Meerits & Kivipõld, 2020).

Measurement Instruments

Authentic Leadership was evaluated using the Extended Authentic Leadership Inventory developed by (Meerits et al., 2021), grounded in (Walumbwa et al., 2008)'s model and (Beddoes-Jones & Swailes, 2015)'s model. This inventory covers five dimensions: relational transparency, self-awareness, self-regulation, ethical regulation, and balanced processing. Each dimension was assessed via five-point Likert-scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 = fairly often and 5 = frequently, if not always. The reliability was measured through Cronbach's alpha and values ranging between .82 and .87, indicating strong internal consistency. **Transformational Leadership** was assessed through the Transformational Leadership Behaviour Inventory (TLBI) developed by (Podsakoff et al., 1990). This inventory identifies six key behaviours: vision articulation, providing an appropriate model, setting high performance expectations, fostering group goals, intellectual stimulation, and personal or individualised support. The participants answered using a seven-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = rather disagree, 4 = neither disagree nor agree, 5 = rather agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree. Internal consistency and reliability were confirmed with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .79 to .89. **Transactional Leadership** was measured using the Leader Reward and Punishment Questionnaire (LRPQ) by (Podsakoff et al., 1984), encompassing both contingent and non-contingent dimensions of rewards and punishments – four factors. The instrument's

reliability, indicated by Cronbach's alpha values ranging .74 to .89. Additionally, for uniformity and consistency a 7-point Likert scale was utilised, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The authentic leadership questionnaire consisted of 27 statements, TLBI consisted of 20 statements, and LRPQ consisted of 20 questions.

Organisational Leadership Capability (OLC) was conceptualised and measured using the framework by Kivipõld and Vadi, which includes three key dimensions or variables (Kivipõld, 2015; Kivipõld & Vadi, 2013; Kivipõld & Vadi, 2010):

1. **Alignment and Cohesion:** This dimension indicates the degree of strategic consistency, shared values, and intra-organisational unity in leadership implementation.
2. **Control-Feedback System:** This dimension encompasses adaptive monitoring mechanisms, performance feedback loops, and learning capacities.
3. **Architecture of Internal Network:** This dimension refers to the design of internal communication and relational infrastructure that enables the emergence of distributed and cross-functional leadership.

A seven-point scale was utilised ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, with the nature of the questionnaire using closed-ended statements. Every component's internal reliability was confirmed with Cronbach's alpha values ranging (.71-.89). Validity was ensured by applying constructs previously validated in both military and corporate environments. Surveys were conducted in a supervised, standardised format using paper-based tools during the midpoint of conscript service. Participation was voluntary, anonymous and received ethical approval from relevant institutional boards. Trained researchers were responsible for distributing and collecting the surveys to maintain consistency. The administration window lasted 1-2 days for each group to minimise the risk of fatigue bias and contextual response shifts (Kivipõld & Vadi, 2013; Meerits & Kivipõld, 2020).

Data Analysis Strategy

Data was analysed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics and reliability tests were performed to validate the scale validity. Multiple linear regression was then used to examine the influence of leadership behaviours (independent variables) on OLC variables (dependent

variables). OLC was conceptualised as a mediating factor connecting leadership behaviours to self-management capability (Kivipõld & Vadi, 2010; Kivipõld & Vadi, 2013). While mediation analysis was conceptually implied, direct statistical mediation (e.g., bootstrapping) was not executed due to limitations in data access and software capabilities. Nonetheless, prior empirical research provides a strong theoretical grounding for this mediating relationship (Kivipõld & Vadi, 2010; Kivipõld & Vadi, 2013). With a sample of over 1,000 participants, the study exceeds the minimum power threshold for regression analysis as recommended by (Cohen, 1988), ensuring robust inferential capability.

4. Results

This results section outlines the empirical findings of the study based on a quantitative approach to analyse leadership behaviours and their relationship with organisational leadership capability (OLC), which in turn serves as a mechanism that facilitates self-management. Through the use of multiple regression analysis, we evaluated how the dimensions of authentic, transformational, and transactional leadership predict three components of OLC: Alignment & Cohesion (OAC), Control-Feedback System (CFS), and Architecture of Internal Network (AIN).

Leadership Behaviours and Their Effects on OLC

The quantitative findings indicate that various leadership behaviours, each grounded in one of the three leadership styles, have differing impacts on the development of OLC dimensions. **Authentic Leadership** behaviours, particularly ethical regulation, relational transparency, and balance processing showed strong associations with OAC, CFS and AIN. Particularly, balance processing had a strong correlation with CFS. These findings suggest that leaders who adopt ethical behaviour, cultivate openness, and fairly evaluate differing perspectives are more likely to build trust, psychological safety, and shared responsibility, core pillars of self-management. **Transformational Leadership** behaviours, including vision articulation and intellectual stimulation, were identified as crucial for driving both OAC & CFS. These characteristics are pivotal for promoting a common direction and enabling teams to adapt and manage their performance through continuous learning and feedback loops. **Transactional Leadership**, especially through the contingent reward mechanism, exhibited a statistically significant influence across all three OLC dimensions. This consistent influence

indicates the importance of goal clarity, reward structures, and performance monitoring in reinforcing behaviour that facilitate self-management at an operational level.

The table below summarises the specific dimensions impacted by key leadership behaviours:

Table 1 – Leadership behaviours impact on OLC's three dimensions

Results of Linear Regressions

| Variable | OAC | CFS | AIN |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Constant | .43 | -.47 | .08 |
| <i>Authentic Leadership</i> | | | |
| Self-awareness | -.06 | .09 | .17 |
| Self-regulation | -.02 | .02 | -.16+ |
| Ethical regulation | .20+ | .13 | .19+ |
| Balance processing | .02 | .23** | .00 |
| Relational transparency | .02 | .18+ | .08 |
| <i>Transformational Leadership</i> | | | |
| Appropriate model | .05 | -.07 | .00 |
| High performance expectation | .00 | -.01 | -.01 |
| Intellectual stimulation | .14** | .12** | .02 |
| Fostering group goals | -.01 | -.05 | -.10 |
| Personal support | .07 | .03 | .09 |
| Vision articulation | .14* | .03 | .09 |
| <i>Transactional Leadership</i> | | | |
| Contingent reward | .20*** | .47*** | .20*** |
| Non-contingent reward | .04 | .02 | .12** |
| Contingent punishment | .04 | .06 | -.01 |
| Non-contingent punishment | .06 | -.03 | .09* |
| R-squared | .27 | .40 | .25 |
| F stat. | 23.79*** | 43.53*** | 21.27*** |

Note: + – p<0.1; * – p<0.05; ** – p<0.01;

*** - p<0.001

OAC – orientation & alignment

CFS – control-feedback system

AIN – architecture of internal network

Comparative Impact Across Leadership Styles

The findings indicate that each leadership contributes uniquely and complementarily to the organisational leadership capability. Authentic leadership fosters trust, transparency, and ethical consistency, which are essential for promoting employee autonomy and shared decision-making. Transformational leadership amplifies strategic alignment and adaptive thinking, enabling teams to align their purpose while continuously evolving through feedback. Transactional leadership reinforces organisational structure by establishing accountability mechanisms and performance-oriented clarity. Furthermore, each leadership is distinctly aligned with different domains of organisational functioning: authentic leadership is primarily influential in the social domain, encompassing relational and moral dimensions; transformational leadership facilitates change through developing and delegating, while transactional leadership is more rooted in task orientation, characterised by commanding and reacting, including reward and punishment. Instead of advocating for a single dominant leadership style, the evidence suggests that an integrated leadership model is most effective for fostering self-management through OLC. Authentic behaviours establish a foundation for psychological safety; transformational traits inspire innovation and strategic direction; and transactional mechanisms maintain operational discipline and performance consistency. Collectively, these elements create the conditions necessary for implementing sustainable self-management within organisations.

Summary of Key Insights

This study emphasises that leadership is not a singular concept but rather a dynamic interaction of behavioural dimensions that collectively shape organisational leadership capability. The findings reveal how distinct leadership behaviours are linked to specific aspects of self-management, indicating a complementary relationship rather than hierarchical one. Among the variables examined, contingent reward (transactional) and intellectual stimulation (transformational) consistently influenced multiple dimensions, highlighting the significance of merging clarity in expectations with opportunities for growth and innovation. Authentic leadership is particularly notable for its role in social domain of organisations,

promoting relational trust, ethical standards, and moral alignment. Transformational leadership facilitates change by nurturing a culture of learning and strategic alignment, whereas transactional leadership anchors task-oriented processes through structured reinforcement mechanisms. Together, these findings advocate for an integrative leadership model that values both interpersonal depth and operational structure. By aligning leadership behaviours with specific needs of the organisation, leaders can more effectively cultivate self-management in teams and strengthen leadership capacity within the organisation.

Conclusion & Discussion

This thesis aimed to investigate how three leadership behaviours; authentic, transformational and transactional, contribute to the development of self-management within organisational contexts, mediated by Organisational Leadership Capability (OLC). The core aim was to address an important gap in the leadership literature: to understand and explain how these different leadership styles can facilitate decentralised, self-regulating team dynamics in a structured yet adaptable manner. Results extracted from a robust quantitative analysis of data collected from 1,079 Estonian military conscripts, the findings show a complex and multifaceted interaction between different leadership styles and the structural prerequisites of self-management. Authentic leadership was found to be the driving factor behind social cohesion and moral grounding within teams, which build relational trust and self-awareness. Transformational leadership promoted self-management through vision sharing, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration, which closely reflect the motivational dimensions of decentralised teams. Although, typically defined as task-oriented, transactional leadership was found to be responsible for the preservation of operational clarity and accountability through reward-based systems. Overall, these complementary functions created an integrated whole that explains the manner in which leadership behaviours shape self-management practices, when observed through the lens of organisational leadership capability.

A key insight from this research highlights the importance of a mixed and integrated set of leadership styles or behaviours to effectively enable self-management, rather than reliance on a singular leadership behaviour or style approach. The findings offer several practical recommendations for leaders and organisations aiming to promote self-management.

Firstly, organisations should invest in leadership development programmes that integrate authentic, transformational, and transactional elements. Leaders being trained in such settings would not only focus on vision-setting and relationship-building but would keep in mind accountability and performance monitoring. Another recommendation would be the decentralised decision-making being embedded within teams, supported by systems for mutual accountability and role flexibility. This structure would allow self-management to flourish while ensuring coordination and goal alignment. Organisations and leaders should also actively shape the culture as implementing self-management is not like implementing a new software system. The culture must already be filled with trust and shared purpose among other things to successfully implement a sustainable model of self-management. Lastly, treating the leadership behaviours as mutually exclusive would be wrong, rather integrating the behavioural elements of all three leadership styles would yield the most balanced and robust form of self-management.

Limitations

While this study provides valuable insights about the relationship between leadership behaviours and organisational self-management, several limitations are to be acknowledged. Firstly, the reliance on secondary data coupled with the use of existing survey measures, as opposed to direct observational fieldwork, limits a deeper understanding of practical implementation challenges and contextual nuances present in real-time organisational settings. Secondly, given the cross-sectional design, this research cannot fully address the dynamic nature or long-term sustainability of leadership-driven self-management outcomes. Longitudinal data would offer clearer insights into evolving leadership impacts over time. Furthermore, the research focused solely on specific leadership behaviours and its effect on self-management through OLC, without considering other potentially significant variables, such as cultural context, emotional intelligence, and digital leadership skills. The lack of these ideas, although focusing on the study aim, results in oversimplifying complex organisational dynamics. Additionally, generalising the findings that are specific in nature of the sampled group, i.e. Estonian military conscripts in a structured hierarchical environment. Variations in industry characteristics, organisational size, team maturity, and geographical cultural differences suggest caution when extrapolating results broadly. Overall, the research treated leadership behaviours as isolated constructs, ignoring the reality in which leaders frequently combine or shift leadership styles dynamically and their own biases. Future

research examining such hybrid leadership approaches would provide for a richer and more practical understanding of their influence on self-management practices.

Future Research

This thesis opens several promising avenues for future research. Starting with, longitudinal or experimental studies should be conducted within organisations and different industrial setting to establish the relationship between leadership behaviours and development of self-management through OLC. Such research would enable researchers to understand how and when leadership behaviours promote self-management, along with other organisational influences and real-time effects of such environments. Secondly, comparative studies across different sectors, including education, startups, healthcare and others would help contextualise the implementation of results beyond military settings. This needs to include cultural-specific variables, such as power distance and individualism-collectivism, to examine leadership and self-management behaviour operating within different cultural paradigms. Moreover, future research could also explore the intensity of leadership behaviour configurations rather than just isolated styles. For instance, would a combination of high authentic leadership and moderate transformational leadership yield better results with regards to self-management? Exploring and understanding such synergies would offer for a more granular guidance for leadership training, which may be applicable to various industries. Lastly, qualitative approaches that are rich with data of leadership experiences in a self-managed team and as a whole organisation would enrich our understanding of the subtle social processes that quantitative methods cannot fully capture.

List of references

1. Kummelstedt, C. (2023). The Role of Hierarchy in Realizing Collective Leadership in a Self-Managing Organization. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 36(3), 355–375.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-022-09615-x>
2. Martela, F. (2019). What makes self-managing organizations novel? Comparing how Weberian bureaucracy, Mintzberg’s adhocracy, and self-organizing solve six fundamental problems of organizing. *Journal of Organization Design*, 8(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41469-019-0062-9>
3. Schell, S., & Bischof, N. (2021). Change the Way of working. Ways into Self-organization with the Use of Holacracy: An Empirical Investigation. *European Management Review*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12457>
4. Ospina, S., & Foldy, E. (2010). Building bridges from the margins: The work of leadership in social change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 292–307.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.008>
5. Lee, M. Y., & Edmondson, A. C. (2017). Self-managing organizations: Exploring the limits of less-hierarchical organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 37(1), 35–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2017.10.002>
6. Reitzig, M. (2022). How to get better at flatter designs: considerations for shaping and leading organizations with less hierarchy. *Journal of Organization Design*, 11, 5–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-022-00109-7>
7. Martela, F. (2023). Managers matter less than we think: How can organizations function without any middle management? *Journal of Organization Design*, 12(1), 19–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-022-00133-7>
8. Lee, M. Y. (2024). Enacting Decentralized Authority: The Practices and Limits of Moving Beyond Hierarchy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 69(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00018392241257372>
9. Hatch, M. J. (2018). *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
10. Salas, E., Reyes, D. L., & McDaniel, S. H. (2018). The science of teamwork: Progress, reflections, and the road ahead. *American Psychologist*, 73(4), 593–600.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000334>
11. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.

12. Ziegert, J. C., Mayer, D. M., Piccolo, R. F., & Graham, K. A. (2021). Collectivistic Leadership in Context: An Examination of How and When Collective Charismatic Leadership Relates to Unit Functioning. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 28(2), 112-136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051820986536>
13. Yammarino, F. J., Salas, E., Serban, A., Shirreffs, K., & Shuffler, M. L. (2012). Collectivistic Leadership Approaches: Putting the “We” in Leadership Science and Practice. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 5(4), 382–402. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01467.x>
14. DeRue, D. S. (2011). Adaptive leadership theory: Leading and following as a complex adaptive process. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31(31), 125–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2011.09.007>
15. Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423–451. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00120-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0)
16. Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed Leadership in Organizations: A Review of Theory and Research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3), 251–269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x>
17. Martela, F., & Nandram, S. (2025). Buurtzorg: scaling up an organization with hundreds of self-managing teams but no middle managers. *Journal of Organization Design*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-024-00184-y>
18. Nicolaidis, V. C., LaPort, K. A., Chen, T. R., Tomassetti, A. J., Weis, E. J., Zaccaro, S. J., & Cortina, J. M. (2014). The shared leadership of teams: A meta-analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(5), 923–942. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.06.006>
19. CARSON, J. B., TESLUK, P. E., & MARRONE, J. A. (2007). Shared Leadership in Teams: An Investigation of Antecedent Conditions and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1217–1234. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159921>
20. Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 288–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.02.007>
21. Alilyyani, B., Wong, C. A., & Cummings, G. (2018). Antecedents, mediators, and Outcomes of Authentic Leadership in healthcare: a Systematic Review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 83(1), 34–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2018.04.001>

22. 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.leafqua.2016.02.006>
23. Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). Authentic leadership: a Review of the Literature and Research Agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(6), 1120–1145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leafqua.2011.09.007>
24. Polat, E., Hasan Evrim Arıcı, & Hüseyin Arasli. (2024). Authentic leadership: A systematic review and research agenda. *Ege Akademik Bakis (Ege Academic Review)*, 24, 369–390. <https://doi.org/10.21121/eab.240302>
25. Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89–126.
26. Almohtaseb, A. A., Almahameed, M. A., Sharari, F. E. A., & Dabbouri, E. A. (2021). The effect of transformation leadership on government employee job satisfaction during Covid-19. *Management Science Letters*, 11(4), 1231–1244. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.11.015>
27. Chua, J., & Ayoko, O. B. (2019). Employees' self-determined motivation, transformational leadership and work engagement. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 27(3), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2018.74>
28. Jiatong, W., Wang, Z., Alam, M., Murad, M., Gul, F., & Gill, S. A. (2022). The impact of transformational leadership on affective organizational commitment and job performance: The mediating role of employee engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(13), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.831060>
29. Jun, K., & Lee, J. (2023). Transformational Leadership and Followers' Innovative behavior: Roles of Commitment to Change and Organizational Support for Creativity. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13040320>
30. Kareem, J., Harold Andrew Patrick, Napoleon Prabakaran, Valarmathi B, Veerta Tantia, Kumar, P., & Mukherjee, U. (2023). Transformational educational leaders inspire school educators' commitment. *Frontiers in Education*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1171513>
31. Kim, H.-D., & Cruz, A. B. (2022). Transformational Leadership and Psychological Well-Being of Service-Oriented Staff: Hybrid Data Synthesis Technique. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(13), 8189. NCBI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19138189>

32. Lin, C. pei, Xian, J., Li, B., & Huang, H. (2020). Transformational Leadership and Employees' Thriving at Work: The Mediating Roles of Challenge-Hindrances Stressors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(1), 1–19. NCBI. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01400>
33. Abbas, M., & Ali, R. (2021). Transformational versus transactional leadership styles and project success: A meta-analytic review. *European Management Journal*, 41(1), 125–142.
34. Blomme, R. J., Kodden, B., & Beasley-Suffolk, A. (2015). Leadership theories and the concept of work engagement: Creating a conceptual framework for management implications and research. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 21(2), 125–144. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2014.71>
35. Garger, J., Jacques, P. H., Veselina Vracheva, & Connolly, C. (2023). Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership: Predicting Academic Performance Beyond and Below Expectations. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 23(3). <https://doi.org/10.21818/001c.90586>
36. Khoshnaw, D., & Karadas, G. (2024). Transactional leadership and Intellectual Capital, the Mediating Role of Knowledge Sharing: The study of Customs Employees in Sulaymaniyah Governorate. *Heliyon*, 10(19), e38747–e38747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e38747>
37. Young, H. R., Glerum, D. R., Joseph, D. L., & McCord, M. A. (2021). A Meta-Analysis of Transactional Leadership and Follower Performance: Double-Edged Effects of LMX and Empowerment. *Journal of Management*, 47(5), 1255–1280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320908646>
38. Kivipõld, K. (2015). Organizational leadership capability – a mechanism of knowledge coordination for inducing innovative behaviour. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 10(4), 478–496. <https://doi.org/10.1108/bjm-10-2014-0152>
39. Kivipõld, K., & Vadi, M. (2010). A measurement tool for the evaluation of organizational leadership capability. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 5(1), 118–136. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17465261011016595>
40. Kivipõld, K., & Vadi, M. (2013). Market orientation in the context of the impact of leadership capability on performance. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 31(5), 368–387. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbm-09-2012-0092>
41. Meerits, A., & Kivipõld, K. (2020). Leadership competencies of first-level military leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-09-2019-0392>

42. Bass, B. M. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational leadership: Learning to Share the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)
43. Meerits, A., Kivipõld, K., & Akuffo, I. N. (2021). Possibilities for Assessing Authentic Leadership competencies: Testing Existing Instruments and Proposing an Extended One. *Management Research Review*, 45(6). <https://doi.org/10.1108/mrr-04-2021-0277>
44. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational Leader Behaviors and Their Effects on Followers' Trust In Leader, Satisfaction, And Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
45. Podsakoff, P. M., Todor, W. D., Grover, R. A., & Huber, V. L. (1984). Situational moderators of leader reward and punishment behaviors: Fact or fiction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34(1), 21–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(84\)90036-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(84)90036-9)
46. Beddoes-Jones, F., & Swailes, S. (2015). Authentic leadership: development of a new three pillar model. *Strategic HR Review*, 14(3), 94–99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/shr-04-2015-0032>

Resüme

JUHI JUHTIMISKÄITUMINE JA KOLLEKTIIVNE EESTVEDAMINE: KUIDAS JUHID KUJUNDAVAD ISEJUHTIMIST

Syed Muhammad Mazhar Bukhari

Käesolev magistritöö uurib, kuidas erinevad juhtimisstiilid; autentne, transformatsiooniline ja tehinguline aitavad kaasa organisatsioonide isejuhtimisvõimele. Uuringu põhieesmärgiks oli välja selgitada, kuidas need kolm juhtimiskäitumist toetavad praktiliselt organisatsiooni isejuhtimist, arvestades organisatsioonilise eestvedamise terviklikku mõju. Keskne uurimisküsimus oli seega, kuidas juhtide käitumine edendab isejuhtimise rakendumist reaalses organisatsioonilistes tingimustes.

Sellele küsimusele vastamiseks kasutati kvantitatiivset lähenemist, kus küsitleti 1079 Eesti ajateenijat. Ajateenijad täitsid küsimustikud, mis mõõtsid autentse, transformatsioonilise ja tehingulise juhtimise käitumisviiside tugevust ning nende mõju organisatsiooni juhtimisele. Autentse juhtimise mõõtmine keskendus juhtide avatusele, eetilisele ja otsuste tasakaalukusele. Transformatsiooniline juhtimine hindas, kuidas juhid oskasid selgelt visioone edastada, uuenduslikku mõtlemist soodustada ja isikupärastatud tuge pakkuda. Tehinguline juhtimine põhines selgelt määratletud tasude ja ülesannete struktuuril ning vastutusmehhanismidel.

Uuringu tulemused näitasid, et iga juhtimisstiil andis erilise panuse organisatsioonilise isejuhtimise arengusse. Autentne juhtimine suurendas usaldust, avatust ja eetilist selgust, parandades sellega meeskondade omavahelist suhtlust. Transformatsiooniline juhtimine oli eriti edukas meeskondade strateegilisel joondamisel ühise visiooni ümber ning pideva õppimise ja kohanemisvõime suurendamisel. Tehinguline juhtimine tagas järjekindlalt selged ootused, rollide määratlused ning operatiivse tõhususe tänu selgele tasustamise ja vastutuse süsteemile.

Üks peamisi järeldusi oli, et ükski juhtimisstiil üksinda ei olnud piisav. Selle asemel osutus kõige tõhusamaks just integreeritud lähenemine, mis kombineeris kõiki kolme stiili. Autentne juhtimine lõi vajaliku usalduse ja avatuse, transformatsiooniline juhtimine pakkus selge strateegilise suuna ja paindlikkuse, ning tehinguline juhtimine kindlustas struktureeritud, järjepideva tulemuslikkuse ja selge vastutussüsteemi.

Uuring pakub praktilisi soovitusi organisatsioonidele, kes soovivad liikuda isejuhtimise poole. Soovitatakse luua juhtimiskoolitusi, kus integreeritakse kõik kolm juhtimisstiili; usaldust loov, visioonipõhine, uuendusmeelne ja selget vastutust tagav lähenemine. Lisaks peaksid organisatsioonid juurutama otsustusõiguse hajutamist

meeskondade sees ning looma tingimused, kus meeskonnad võtavad üksteise ees vastutuse efektiivselt.

Uuringus tõdeti ka teatavaid piiranguid. Kuna uuring viidi läbi ainult Eesti ajateenijatega, võib selle tulemuste ülekandmine tsiviilorganisatsioonidele olla piiratud. Lisaks kasutas uuring ristlääbilõikelist lähenemist, mistõttu ei saanud täielikult uurida juhtimiskäitumiste pikaajalist mõju ja muutumist ajas.

Tulevased uuringud võiksid kaaluda longituuduuringuid, erinevate tööstusharude võrdlemist ning kultuuriliste erinevuste sügavamalt uurimist. Samuti võiksid kvalitatiivsed uuringud aidata paremini mõista, kuidas juhtimisdünaamika realselt organisatsioonides toimub, ületades pelgalt küsimustikuvastuste piire.

Kokkuvõttes rõhutab magistritöö selgelt, et autentse, transformatsioonilise ja tehingulise juhtimise efektiivne kombineerimine on hädavajalik organisatsioonidele, mis soovivad liikuda isejuhtimise suunas. Selle asemel, et keskenduda ainult ühele stiilile, saavutavad juhid, kes kombineerivad usalduse loomist, selget visiooni, uuenduslikkust ja struktureeritud vastutust, organisatsioonides suurema vastupidavuse, kohanemisvõime ja jätkusuutliku tulemuslikkuse.

Non-exclusive licence to reproduce thesis and make the thesis public

I, Syed Muhammad Mazhar Bukhari,

1. herewith grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive licence) to

reproduce, for the purpose of preservation, including for adding to the digital archives until the expiry of the term of copyright, my thesis

LEADER'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR AND COLLECTIVISTIC LEADERSHIP: HOW LEADERS CREATE SELF-MANAGEMENT,

supervised by Kurmet Kivipõld;

2. I grant the University of Tartu a permit to make the work specified in point 1 available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives, under the Creative Commons licence CC BY NC ND 4.0, which allows, by giving appropriate credit to the author, to reproduce, distribute the work and communicate it to the public, and prohibits the creation of derivative works and any commercial use of the work until the expiry of the term of copyright.

3. I am aware of the fact that the author retains the rights specified in points 1 and 2.

4. I certify that granting the non-exclusive licence does not infringe other persons' intellectual property rights or rights arising from the personal data protection legislation.

Syed Muhammad Mazhar Bukhari

21/05/2025