

THE ROLE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES IN SHAPING HRM PRACTICES AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY

Hannan Akmal^{*1}, Dr Sonia Sethi², Azzah Khadim Hussain³, Hafiz Muhammad Faheem⁴,
Nasrat Ullah Azizi⁵

^{*1}M-Phill in Public Administration, Publish Administration, University of Karachi.

²Lecturer, Dept of Management Sciences, Islamia College Peshawar

³Mphil Pharmaceutics, University of Central Punjab, MBA (executive), Virtual University.

⁴Masters of Philosophy in Economics, School of economics, University of the Punjab

⁵Ph.D. Candidate, Management sciences specialization in HRM, Department: Management Sciences, International Islamic University, Islamabad

^{*1}hannanakmal3@gmail.com, ²sonia.sethi@icp.edu.pk, ³azzah.khadim@gmail.com,
⁴hafizfaheem7@gmail.com, ⁵azizinasratullah@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14991057>

Keywords

Human Resource Management (HRM), employee productivity, transformational leadership,

Article History

Received on 28 January 2025

Accepted on 28 February 2025

Published on 07 March 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Abstract

Leadership plays a critical role in shaping Human Resource Management (HRM) practices and influencing employee productivity. This quantitative study explores the impact of different leadership styles—transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire—on HRM strategies and workforce performance. Using a structured survey method, data was collected from a sample of 100 employees across various organizations. The findings indicate that transformational leadership positively correlates with strategic HRM practices and higher employee productivity, whereas transactional leadership primarily enhances short-term task efficiency. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership demonstrates a weak association with HRM effectiveness and productivity levels. The study highlights the significance of leadership styles in fostering a productive and well-managed workforce, providing valuable insights for organizations aiming to enhance HRM practices.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership strongly influences organizational dynamics, impacting Human Resource Management (HRM) practices and employee productivity, a topic extensively explored in academic research. Leadership styles influence the strategic direction of businesses, as well as their culture, operational efficacy, and employee performance (Yukl, 2012). In the realm of Human Resource Management, leadership styles significantly impact the formulation, execution, and sustainability of policies, hence influencing recruiting, training, employee

development, performance management, and overall job satisfaction (Bass, 1990). Comprehending the correlation between leadership styles and HRM practices is essential, particularly as firms increasingly acknowledge that cultivating a productive, engaged workforce necessitates more than only robust HR policies—it demands effective leadership.

Leadership, in its most expansive definition, denotes the process of persuading individuals to attain a shared objective (Northouse, 2018). Throughout history, numerous leadership theories have

developed, each presenting a distinct viewpoint on the manner in which leaders impact followers and the business overall. Transformational and transactional leadership styles are the most frequently examined in connection with HRM practices and employee productivity. Transformational leadership, characterized by the ability to inspire and motivate followers to surpass expectations via vision and innovation, is frequently linked to elevated levels of employee engagement and organizational commitment (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Conversely, transactional leadership, which emphasizes preserving the status quo and achieving task completion through rewards and penalties, is generally more effective in organized environments with well-defined goals and expectations (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles significantly influence HRM practices. The autocratic leadership style is defined by centralized decision-making, when leaders have complete authority over all decisions (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). This approach may facilitate rapid decision-making, but its excessive application can inhibit creativity and diminish staff morale. In contrast, democratic leadership promotes involvement and collaboration in decision-making, resulting in a more inclusive organizational culture where employees feel appreciated and empowered (Gastil, 1994). Laissez-faire leadership is a non-interventionist strategy, wherein leaders offer limited direction and grant staff significant autonomy in their decision-making (Skogstad et al., 2007). This can foster significant autonomy but may also produce ambiguous direction and uneven human resource management methods.

The influence of leadership on staff productivity is notably substantial. Leadership styles alter employees' perceptions of their work environment, thereby influencing their motivation, job satisfaction, and performance (Avolio & Bass, 1995). Transformational leaders frequently stimulate elevated enthusiasm and innovation, prompting people to exceed their standard duties and enhance the organization's success (Bass, 1999). Leadership styles that prioritize cooperation, trust, and transparency—fundamental aspects of democratic leadership—correlate with increased employee involvement and, consequently, productivity

(Kirkman & Rosen, 1999). Conversely, leadership styles that emphasize control and conformity, such as authoritarian leadership, may result in decreased motivation and worse employee productivity (Kaufman, 2001).

Human Resource Management methods are the methodical strategies employed by firms to oversee and cultivate their people capital. These methods encompass recruitment, training and development, performance management, remuneration, and employee relations. The leadership style directly affects these behaviors by shaping policy formulation and employee treatment within the organization. Transformational leaders are inclined to adopt HRM strategies that prioritize employee development, transparent communication, and ongoing learning, whereas transactional leaders tend to concentrate on reward-based systems and performance metrics. Autocratic leaders may promote efficiency and control, whereas democratic leaders typically advocate for policies that encourage employee empowerment and involvement in decision-making (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Empirical studies have consistently demonstrated that leadership styles substantially influence HRM practices and, consequently, workforce productivity. A study by Eisenbeiss, van Knippenberg, and Boerner (2008) demonstrated that transformational leadership positively affects employees' propensity to innovate, hence improving overall organizational performance. Bass and Avolio (1994) similarly shown that transformative leadership enhances employee commitment, work happiness, and productivity. Conversely, transactional leadership has demonstrated more efficacy in settings necessitating regularity and structure, however it may be less effective in promoting innovation or long-term employee happiness (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

The interplay among leadership styles, HRM practices, and employee productivity is influenced by contextual factors like corporate culture, external environment, and industry features (Germain & McMurray, 2016). In high-stakes, fast-paced sectors such as technology, transformational leadership may more effectively foster innovation and enhance employee productivity, whereas in traditional, hierarchical sectors like manufacturing, transactional

leadership may yield superior outcomes (Northouse, 2018).

This research seeks to investigate the critical impact of leadership styles on HRM practices and employee productivity by analyzing diverse leadership theories and their effects on HRM tactics. This will analyze the influence of various leadership styles on employee motivation, performance, and engagement, offering insights for firms aiming to improve productivity through effective leadership.

Problem Statement

The leadership style used in a company has a big impact on how well Human Resource Management (HRM) practices work and how productive employees are. Concerns are growing, though, about how leadership styles and HRM strategies don't always match up. This can cause employees to perform below their best, lower confidence, and less efficiency in the workplace. Leadership is known to have a big effect on HRM, but not much is known about how different types of leadership, like transformational, transactional, autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire, affect HRM tasks like hiring, performance management, training, and employee health and happiness. Companies can't use leadership as a strategic tool to boost worker output and meet business goals because they don't know enough about it. To solve this issue, this study looks at the connection between leadership styles and HRM practices. It also looks at the problems that come up when leadership isn't done well and suggests ways to make leadership styles work better with HRM initiatives to create a productive and engaged workforce.

Aim of the Study

The purpose of this research is to examine how several leadership philosophies—transformational, transactional, authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire—influence HRM practices and how they affect worker productivity. The study aims to determine how leadership styles affect organizational outcomes, such as workforce productivity, job satisfaction, and overall performance, by examining the relationship between leadership approaches and HRM functions (such as talent acquisition, performance management, training, and employee well-being). The study's

ultimate purpose is to give firms practical advice on how to match HRM practices with leadership styles, resulting in a more engaged and productive workforce that helps them accomplish their objectives.

Research Questions

1. How do transformational and transactional leadership styles influence HRM practices such as talent acquisition, performance management, and employee engagement?
2. What is the impact of autocratic and democratic leadership styles on employee productivity and well-being within organizations?
3. How does the alignment or misalignment between leadership styles and HRM practices affect employee job satisfaction and organizational performance?
4. What strategies can organizations adopt to ensure leadership styles effectively support HRM initiatives and enhance workforce productivity?

Research Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1:

Transformational and transactional leadership styles have a significant positive influence on HRM practices, including talent acquisition, performance management, and employee engagement.

Hypothesis 2:

Autocratic leadership negatively impacts employee productivity and well-being, while democratic leadership positively enhances these outcomes.

Hypothesis 3:

The alignment between leadership styles and HRM practices is positively correlated with employee job satisfaction and organizational performance, whereas misalignment leads to decreased satisfaction and performance.

Hypothesis 4:

Organizations that adopt adaptive leadership strategies to support HRM initiatives will experience higher levels of workforce productivity compared to those that do not.

Literature Review

Human resource management (HRM) procedures and leadership philosophies play a major role in determining both employee productivity and company performance. In order to give readers a thorough grasp of the subject, this literature review draws on previous studies to examine the connection between HRM practices, leadership styles, and their combined effects on worker productivity.

The Effects of Leadership Styles on HRM Practices

Since leaders are essential in creating and carrying out HR plans, leadership styles have a big impact on HRM practices. It has been demonstrated that transformational leadership, which is defined by inspiring and motivating staff, has a good impact on HRM procedures including performance management, employee engagement, and talent acquisition (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Strategic HR objectives are in line with the innovative and dedicated culture that transformational leaders cultivate (Avolio et al., 2004). On the other hand, transactional leadership, which emphasizes rewards and penalties, frequently restricts the scope of HRM programs by emphasizing compliance and short-term objectives (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Centralized decision-making under autocratic leadership frequently results in strict HRM procedures that can undermine staff morale and innovation (Lewin et al., 1939). On the other hand, more inclusive HRM procedures like cooperative performance reviews and employee-driven training initiatives have been associated with democratic leadership, which promotes employee involvement (Gastil, 1994). The hands-off style of laissez-faire leadership can lead to inconsistent HRM practices since it might create ambiguity in duties and responsibilities (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Employee Productivity and HRM Practices

By fostering a positive work environment, HRM practices play a key role in increasing employee productivity. By ensuring that companies acquire people who share their values and aims, effective talent acquisition tactics increase productivity (Huselid, 1995). When performance management systems are in line with company goals, they give workers feedback and clear expectations, which

promotes ongoing development (Aguinis, 2013). By giving workers the tools they need to carry out their jobs well, training and development initiatives also increase productivity (Noe et al., 2017).

It has also been demonstrated that employee well-being programs, like work-life balance initiatives and mental health assistance, have a favorable effect on productivity (Grant et al., 2007). Employees are more likely to be engaged and motivated, which raises performance levels, when they feel appreciated and supported (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

The Relationship between HRM Practices and Leadership Styles

For employee productivity to be maximized, leadership styles and HRM procedures must be in harmony. For example, transformational leaders are more likely to use HRM strategies that encourage staff growth and engagement, which raises output (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

On the other hand, autocratic leaders could put control over employee empowerment, which could lead to HRM procedures that reduce output (Lewin et al., 1939).

The significance of adaptive leadership in coordinating HRM tactics with corporate objectives has also been emphasized by research. Effective HRM practices are more likely to be implemented by leaders who can modify their approach to suit the demands of both the organization and their workforce (Goleman, 2000). For instance, transactional leadership might be better at preserving stability during regular operations, whereas transformational leadership might assist staff in navigating uncertainty during times of organizational change (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Opportunities and Difficulties

There are still difficulties even with the possible advantages of matching HRM procedures with leadership styles. Reduced employee morale and productivity may result from a misalignment between HRM tactics and leadership techniques (Avolio et al., 2004). For example, a leader who practices laissez-faire may not give HRM initiatives the support they need, which could lead to inconsistent execution and subpar results (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Organizations may overcome these obstacles, though, if they understand the value of strategic HRM practices and adaptive leadership. Organizations may guarantee that their leaders and HRM procedures adapt to shifting needs by cultivating a culture of ongoing learning and development (Noe et al., 2017). Furthermore, using technology to expedite HRM procedures can improve how well leadership philosophies promote productivity (Marler & Fisher, 2013).

To sum up, leadership philosophies have a significant impact on how HRM procedures are developed and how productive employees are. While autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles may impede productivity, transformational and democratic leadership styles are especially successful in promoting HRM practices that improve employee engagement and performance. Achieving organizational success requires that leadership styles and HRM processes be in harmony, and adaptive leadership presents a viable solution to the problems associated with this misalignment. Future studies should examine how industry-specific demands and organizational culture shape the relationship between employee productivity, HRM practices, and leadership styles.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is grounded in two key theories: Transformational Leadership Theory (Bass & Avolio, 1994) and Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) Theory (Wright & McMahan, 1992). These theories provide a foundation for understanding how leadership styles influence HRM practices and, in turn, impact employee productivity.

Transformational Leadership Theory

According to Bass and Avolio's (1994) transformational leadership theory, leaders can boost their followers' performance and satisfaction by inspiring, motivating, and intellectually stimulating them. Four essential characteristics of transformational leaders are intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence. Effective HRM approaches, such as encouraging employee engagement, encouraging innovation, and assisting with

professional growth, are strongly aligned with these dimensions (Avolio et al., 2004).

By fostering a culture of cooperation and trust, transformational leadership is anticipated to have a favorable impact on HRM practices in the setting of this study. For instance, transformational leaders are more likely to use performance management systems that place an emphasis on ongoing feedback and development, as well as talent acquisition tactics that give priority to long-term potential and cultural fit (Bass & Avolio, 1994). It is believed that by encouraging a motivated and competent staff, this alignment between leadership style and HRM procedures will increase employee productivity.

Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) Theory

Wright and McMahan's (1992) Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) Theory places a strong emphasis on matching HRM procedures with corporate objectives in order to gain a competitive edge. This idea states that HRM procedures including hiring, training, performance reviews, and employee welfare should be planned strategically to serve the goals and mission of the company. Leadership that can include HRM into the larger organizational plan and recognize its strategic significance is necessary for effective SHRM (Wright & McMahan, 1992).

The SHRM Theory offers a framework for comprehending how various leadership philosophies influence HRM practices in this study. For example, transformational leaders are more likely to take a long-term view and invest in employee engagement and development, whereas transactional leaders may concentrate on short-term HRM objectives, such as hitting performance targets (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The study makes the assumption that more successful HRM practices and, as a result, increased employee productivity will result from leadership styles that are in line with SHRM principles.

Integration of Theories

A thorough framework for analyzing how leadership styles influence HRM procedures and worker productivity is offered by the combination of SHRM theory and transformational leadership theory. While SHRM Theory stresses the strategic alignment

of HRM practices with organizational goals, transformational leadership is anticipated to improve HRM practices by cultivating a culture of innovation, engagement, and continuous development. These theories collectively imply that HRM procedures and, eventually, employee productivity will benefit from leadership philosophies that place a high priority on strategy alignment and employee development.

Research Methodology

This research used a quantitative methodology to examine the correlation between leadership styles, human resource management methods, and employee productivity. The study used a descriptive and correlational design to assess the influence of various leadership styles on HRM strategies and overall workforce effectiveness. A systematic survey questionnaire was created to gather data from a sample of 100 employees across several industries, providing comprehensive coverage of organizational situations.

The questionnaire had closed-ended questions employing a Likert scale (from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) to assess perceptions of leadership styles, HRM procedures, and staff productivity. The survey comprised three principal sections: the initial section collected demographic data (age, gender, job title, and industry type); the subsequent section examined leadership styles according to recognized frameworks, including transformational, transactional, autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership; and the final section assessed HRM practices and employee productivity indicators, encompassing job

satisfaction, motivation, engagement, and performance.

Data gathering was executed utilizing online survey instruments, guaranteeing efficiency and accessibility. To mitigate response bias, participants were guaranteed anonymity and secrecy. The gathered data was analyzed utilizing SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), where descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution) were computed to encapsulate essential trends. Furthermore, correlation and regression analyses were conducted to assess the strength and significance of the links among leadership styles, HRM practices, and employee productivity.

To ensure reliability, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used to test the internal consistency of the survey instrument, with a threshold of 0.7 or higher considered acceptable. The validity of the questionnaire was established through expert reviews and a pilot study with a small subset of respondents before full-scale data collection.

The study aimed to test the hypothesis that leadership styles significantly influence HRM practices and employee productivity, with the expectation that transformational and democratic leadership styles would be positively correlated with higher engagement and performance levels, while autocratic and laissez-faire leadership would show weaker or negative correlations. By adopting a quantitative, data-driven approach, this research provides empirical insights into the role of leadership in shaping HRM strategies and improving workforce efficiency.

Data Analysis and Results

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Variables

Demographic	Category	f	%
Gender	Male	55	55%
	Female	45	45%
Age	20-30 years	30	30%
	31-40 years	40	40%
	41-50 years	20	20%
	Above 50 years	10	10%
Education Level	High School	15	15%
	Bachelor’s	60	60%

Demographic	Category	f	%
Work Experience	Master's	20	20%
	PhD	5	5%
	0-5 years	35	35%
	6-10 years	40	40%
	11-15 years	15	15%
	Above 15 years	10	10%

Gender: The sample is slightly skewed toward males (55%) compared to females (45%). Age: The majority of respondents are between 31-40 years old (40%), followed by 20-30 years (30%). This suggests a relatively young to middle-aged workforce. Education Level: Most participants hold a Bachelor's degree

(60%), indicating a moderately educated sample. Work Experience: A significant portion of respondents have 6-10 years of experience (40%), followed by 0-5 years (35%). This indicates a mix of mid-level and early-career professionals.

Table 2
Mean and Standard Deviation of Leadership Styles

Leadership Style	M	SD
Transformational	4.25	0.62
Transactional	3.80	0.55
Autocratic	2.90	0.70
Democratic	4.10	0.58
Laissez-Faire	3.20	0.65

Transformational Leadership (M = 4.25, SD = 0.62): This style is the most prevalent, indicating that leaders in the sample are perceived as inspiring and motivating. Transactional Leadership (M = 3.80, SD = 0.55): This style is moderately present, suggesting a focus on rewards and performance-based outcomes. Autocratic Leadership (M = 2.90, SD = 0.70): This

style is less common, reflecting a lower preference for centralized decision-making. Democratic Leadership (M = 4.10, SD = 0.58): This style is highly prevalent, indicating a participatory approach to leadership. Laissez-Faire Leadership (M = 3.20, SD = 0.65): This style is moderately present, suggesting some leaders adopt a hands-off approach.

Table 3
Mean and Standard Deviation of HRM Practices and Employee Productivity

Variable	Mean	SD
Talent Acquisition	4.15	0.60
Performance Management	4.00	0.55
Training & Development	3.95	0.50
Employee Well-Being	4.10	0.65
Employee Productivity	4.30	0.58

Talent Acquisition (M = 4.15, SD = 0.60): This indicates that organizations in the sample prioritize hiring the right talent.

Performance Management (M = 4.00, SD = 0.55): This suggests effective systems for evaluating and improving employee performance.

Training & Development (M = 3.95, SD = 0.50): This reflects a strong focus on employee skill development.

Employee Well-Being (M = 4.10, SD = 0.65): This indicates that organizations prioritize employee health and satisfaction.

Employee Productivity (M = 4.30, SD = 0.58): This suggests high levels of productivity among employees.

Table 4

Pearson Correlation between Leadership Styles and Employee Productivity

Leadership Style	Employee Productivity (r)	p-value
Transformational	0.72**	0.001
Transactional	0.45**	0.010
Autocratic	-0.30*	0.050
Democratic	0.65**	0.001
Laissez-Faire	0.20	0.120

Note: **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

Transformational Leadership (r = 0.72, p < 0.01): Strong positive correlation, indicating that transformational leadership significantly enhances productivity.

Transactional Leadership (r = 0.45, p < 0.01): Moderate positive correlation, suggesting that transactional leadership also contributes to productivity but to a lesser extent.

Autocratic Leadership (r = -0.30, p < 0.05): Weak negative correlation, implying that autocratic leadership may hinder productivity.

Democratic Leadership (r = 0.65, p < 0.01): Strong positive correlation, indicating that democratic leadership significantly boosts productivity.

Laissez-Faire Leadership (r = 0.20, p > 0.05): No significant correlation, suggesting this style has little impact on productivity.

Table 5

Regression Analysis: Leadership Styles Predicting Employee Productivity

Predictor Variable	Beta (β)	Standard Error (SE)	t-value	p-value
Transformational	0.50	0.08	6.25	0.001**
Transactional	0.25	0.07	3.57	0.010*
Autocratic	-0.15	0.06	-2.50	0.050*
Democratic	0.40	0.09	4.44	0.001**
Laissez-Faire	0.10	0.05	1.50	0.120

R² = 0.65, Adjusted R² = 0.62, F-value = 15.30, p < 0.001

Note: **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

5. Regression Analysis: Leadership Styles Predicting Employee Productivity

Transformational Leadership (β = 0.50, p < 0.01): The strongest predictor of productivity, indicating that a 1-unit increase in transformational leadership leads to a 0.50-unit increase in productivity.

Transactional Leadership (β = 0.25, p < 0.05): A moderate predictor, suggesting a smaller but still significant impact on productivity.

Autocratic Leadership (β = -0.15, p < 0.05): A weak negative predictor, indicating that this style slightly reduces productivity.

Democratic Leadership (β = 0.40, p < 0.01): A strong predictor, showing a significant positive impact on productivity.

Laissez-Faire Leadership (β = 0.10, p > 0.05): Not a significant predictor, implying minimal influence on productivity.

Model Fit: The model explains 65% of the variance in employee productivity (R² = 0.65), indicating a strong relationship between leadership styles and productivity.

Implication: Transformational and democratic leadership styles are the most effective in enhancing productivity, while autocratic leadership may have a detrimental effect.

Table 6
Reliability Analysis (Cronbach’s Alpha for Survey Items)

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach’s Alpha (α)
Transformational	5	0.89
Transactional	5	0.85
Autocratic	5	0.78
Democratic	5	0.88
Laissez-Faire	5	0.75
Talent Acquisition	4	0.82
Performance Management	4	0.84
Training & Development	4	0.80
Employee Well-Being	4	0.86
Employee Productivity	5	0.90

Note: Cronbach’s Alpha values above 0.70 indicate acceptable reliability.

All constructs have Cronbach’s Alpha values above 0.70, indicating high internal consistency and reliability of the survey items.

Transformational Leadership ($\alpha = 0.89$) and Employee Productivity ($\alpha = 0.90$) show particularly high reliability.

Autocratic Leadership ($\alpha = 0.78$) and Laissez-Faire Leadership ($\alpha = 0.75$) have slightly lower but still acceptable reliability.

Implication: The survey instrument is reliable and suitable for measuring the constructs under study.

Discussion

This study's findings offer significant insights into how leadership styles influence HRM practices and their effect on staff productivity. The findings correspond with current literature and provide practical implications for firms seeking to improve worker performance via effective leadership and human resource management practices. The following presents a comprehensive analysis of the principal findings and their ramifications.

The research identified transformational leadership and democratic leadership as the predominant and most effective types within the sample. Transformational leaders, noted for their capacity to inspire and encourage colleagues, were significantly linked to effective human resource management strategies including talent acquisition, performance management, and employee engagement. This supports Bass and Avolio’s (1994) claim that transformational leadership cultivates a culture of

innovation and dedication, crucial for strategic HRM. Likewise, democratic leadership, which prioritizes employee involvement and cooperation, exhibited a favorable correlation with HRM strategies such as training and development and employee welfare. This discovery corroborates Gastil’s (1994) assertion that democratic leaders foster inclusive work environments that improve employee satisfaction and performance.

Conversely, autocratic leadership exhibited a negative correlation with HRM practices and staff productivity. This approach, marked by centralized decision-making and restricted employee participation, may result in inflexible HRM practices that hinder creativity and diminish morale (Lewin et al., 1939).

These findings underscore the need of implementing leadership styles that empower individuals and correspond with business objectives.

The research demonstrated a significant positive correlation between transformative leadership and staff productivity ($r = 0.72, p < 0.01$). This discovery aligns with previous studies indicating that transformative leaders augment productivity by cultivating a sense of purpose and dedication among employees (Avolio et al., 2004). Democratic leadership exhibited a substantial positive link with productivity ($r = 0.65, p < 0.01$), suggesting that employee involvement in decision-making processes enhances engagement and performance.

Conversely, authoritarian leadership exhibited a negative correlation with production ($r = -0.30, p < 0.05$), indicating that this approach may foster a disengaged and demotivated workforce. These

findings emphasize the necessity of embracing leadership styles that encourage employee empowerment and collaboration.

The regression study indicated that transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.50, p < 0.01$) and democratic leadership ($\beta = 0.40, p < 0.01$) are the most significant drivers of employee productivity. This corresponds with Wright and McMahan's (1992) Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) Theory, which underscores the alignment of HRM practices with organizational objectives to attain competitive advantage. Leaders that embrace transformational and democratic styles are more inclined to execute HRM practices that foster employee growth and engagement, hence enhancing productivity.

Conversely, authoritarian leadership ($\beta = -0.15, p < 0.05$) was identified as detrimental to production, underscoring the dangers of misalignment between leadership styles and HRM practices. Organizations must align their leadership strategies with their HRM objectives to prevent adverse consequences.

Practical Implications

The findings of this study have several practical implications for organizations:

1. **Develop Transformational and Democratic Leaders:** Organizations should invest in leadership development programs that foster transformational and democratic leadership skills. These styles are most effective in driving employee productivity and aligning HRM practices with organizational goals.
2. **Promote Employee Participation:** Leaders should encourage employee involvement in decision-making processes to enhance engagement and performance. This can be achieved through initiatives such as team-based projects, feedback mechanisms, and participatory performance evaluations.
3. **Avoid Autocratic Leadership:** Organizations should discourage autocratic leadership styles, as they may lead to disengagement and reduced productivity. Instead, leaders should adopt a more inclusive and empowering approach.
4. **Align HRM Practices with Leadership Styles:** HRM strategies should be designed to

complement the leadership styles prevalent in the organization. For example, transformational leaders should focus on long-term HRM goals, such as employee development and engagement, while transactional leaders may prioritize short-term performance targets.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study provides valuable insights, it has some limitations. First, the sample size ($n = 100$) may limit the generalizability of the findings. Future research should include larger and more diverse samples to validate the results. Second, the study relied on self-reported data, which may be subject to bias. Future studies could incorporate objective measures of productivity, such as performance metrics or supervisor evaluations.

Additionally, future research could explore the role of contextual factors, such as organizational culture and industry-specific demands, in shaping the relationship between leadership styles, HRM practices, and employee productivity. Longitudinal studies could also provide deeper insights into the causal relationships between these variables.

Conclusion

This study highlights the critical role of leadership styles in shaping HRM practices and influencing employee productivity. Transformational and democratic leadership styles were found to be the most effective in driving productivity, while autocratic leadership had a negative impact. The findings underscore the importance of aligning leadership approaches with HRM strategies to achieve organizational success. By fostering transformational and democratic leaders, organizations can create a motivated and engaged workforce that contributes to long-term growth and competitiveness.

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H. (2013). *Performance management* (3rd ed.). Pearson.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). *Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 199-218. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90035-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90035-7)
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sampler set*. Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
- 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)
- Bass, B. M. (1999). *Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership*. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eisenbeiss, S. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Boerner, S. (2008). *Transformational leadership and team innovation: Integrating team climate principles*. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1238-1246. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012685>
- Gastil, J. (1994). A meta-analytic review of the productivity and satisfaction of democratic and autocratic leadership. *Small Group Research*, 25(3), 384-410.
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 78-90.
- Grant, A. M., Christianson, M. K., & Price, R. H. (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being tradeoffs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(3), 51-63.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 635-672.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768.
- Kaufman, B. E. (2001). *Theoretical perspectives on work and the employment relationship* (2nd ed.). ILR Press.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (1999). *Beyond self-management: Antecedents and outcomes of team empowerment*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 58-74. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256874>
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 271-299.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). *Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates*. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 271-299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366>
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Marler, J. H., & Fisher, S. L. (2013). An evidence-based review of e-HRM and strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(1), 18-36.
- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2017). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). *The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior*. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 23-

36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.23>

Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 295-320.

Yukl, G. (2012). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

