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Abstract—This paper examines the relationship between the demographics of respondents, leadership styles, organisational innovation, and organisational performance, and discusses which styles of leadership are supportive to business. The research sampled 419 managers by survey questionnaire; in analysing the data, the statistical technique of hierarchical multiple regression was applied. Results show that leadership styles do have an influence on organisational performance. In addition, they indicate an association between leadership styles and organisational performance, mediated by organisational innovation.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The success of an organisation in the age of the dynamic marketplace is solidly connected to how innovative executives manage in the digital economy. Hagen and Lodha [1] endorsed the importance of managers’ contribution in the highly competitive context of globalisation. Currently, academic researchers are suggesting that innovative organisations require innovative managers, whilst organisational innovation calls for invention, investigation and evaluation [2-4] they are also interested in the relationship between the role of leadership and the factors influencing organisational performance through organisational learning and organisational innovation.

Therefore, scholars have proposed the concepts of organisational learning to enhance performance [5, 6] in which managers encourage a learning environment within their organisations; knowledge needs to be distributed throughout the level of the organisation. In addition, in Small Business Enterprises (SMEs), managers are the key persons making day-to-day decisions, considered the most imperative drivers of success in enabling firms to achieve their organisational goals [7-9]. This confirms that the decisiveness of the manager is an essential contribution towards organisational success [10]. Furthermore, Daft [11] emphasised that leadership is one of the most significant aspects in organisations seeking to transform themselves through organisational learning, with the purpose of encouraging organisational innovation. Similarly, Handy [12] stressed that managers play an important role in contributing knowledge and encouraging a learning environment in the organisation.

Hotels can be classified as a sub-category of SMEs, and the leadership of hotel managers is confirmed as a core competency in the hospitality industry [13]. The interconnections between leadership styles, organisational innovation and organisational performance can be developed. Moreover, current academic researchers have found that different leadership styles may lead to different levels of organisational performance [14, 15]. At the same time, Mabey and Ramirez [16] proposed that different leadership styles can create different levels of organisational innovation.

More explicitly, scholars have indicated that leadership styles and innovation are important and interrelated variables contributing to organisational performance. Since appropriate leadership styles can lead to the creation of innovation within an organisation, maintaining customer satisfaction, there is a critical need to examine these relationships [17-19]. Leadership can be observed as a part of learning processes taking place through carrying out day-to-day responsibilities, and in turn influencing the creation of innovation and leading to an increase in organisational performance [16]. Hence, adopting appropriate leadership styles can help to encourage learning in the organisation and this can lead to innovation and improvement in employees’ skills, which in turn can improve organisational performance overall.

II. RESEARCH BACKGROUND

The unit of study of this research is hotels in the hospitality industry in Thailand. Statistics from the Bank of Thailand and Ministry of Commerce [20, 21] show that the service sector represented approximately 52.3 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2012, clearly the largest sector [20, 21]. The growing numbers of tourists travelling all around the world will be boosted in Thailand by the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) event in 2015. This increase in the numbers of inbound tourists visiting Thailand implies further growth in the service sector. Hence, for the development of organisations within the hospitality industry, how to meet customers’ expectations must be understood.

According to the Resources Based View (RBV), internal capabilities enhance competitive advantage and performance. For example, Helfat and Raubitschek [22] found that a system of knowledge and learning increases competitive advantage through innovation and strategic
linkage of products. More specifically, an emerging source of competitive advantage for service industries includes notions, skills and attitudes of their organisational members. Certainly, development of a ‘service quality’ culture accounts for significant increase in service organisations; this results from the practice of best training in human resource management (HRM) and from a strategic approach to implementation. Contributions from HRM are seen as the origin of competitive advantage. Helfat and Raubitschek also suggested high-performing service organisations actively engage in best practice across the areas of recruitment and selection, training and development, communication and team working [23]. Similarly, López- Gamero et al. [24] found that the hospitality industry, and especially the hotel sector, acquires competitive advantage through innovation. Their studies proved that organisations’ resources and competitive advantage act as mediator variables for a positive relationship between environmental protection and financial performance. They also suggested that uncontrollable variables such as environment may influence levels of overall organisational performance.

Georgellis et al. [25] suggested that organisational innovation helps to contribute products and services, and is closely related to maintaining competitive advantage. Even though the system may be restricted by managers’ prior experience, Brush and Chaganti [26] emphasise that managers’ human capital is expanded through the introduction of systems of organisation. These systems might be adopted from formal training to address specific problems such as quality, or from customers or business support agencies, or from specific techniques such as HRM policies [27]. For example, the emphasis of organisational innovation such as changing the way people work, is on producing goods and services different from those of competitors. For example, Microsoft Australia emphasises values such as self-directed teamwork, information sharing, risk-taking, experimentation, tolerance of non-critical mistakes, tolerance of ambiguity and uncertainty as the tasks change rapidly, and a strong orientation towards the marketplace and clients [28]. More specifically, Hofstede [29] found that Thailand is one of the countries in which managers of SMEs can be classified as ‘collectivist’ as they are likely to work as a team; they favour ‘high uncertainty avoidance’ as they are not likely to take risks in business matters, and ‘high power distance’ as they tend to respect others according to hierarchical authority and seniority. This suggests that managers in different areas and types of business may have different management styles, including different ways of applying and encouraging predominant leadership styles and organisational innovation. Hence, it may be useful to study hotel managers in Thailand.

One of the challenges in the tourism and hospitality industry is that it is a people-business relationship requiring a large number of organisational members with innovative competencies to reach customers’ needs [30]. This recognition is particularly relevant in Asia, where regulations are not as stringent as in other developed economies [30]. Shaw et al. [31] envisaged that in 2017 the greatest number of employees in the travel and tourism industry would be in Asia: China, India, Japan, Indonesia and Thailand respectively [30]. This clearly shows that Thailand is making the most of business opportunities in the service sector under the AEC. Thai businesses have good prospects following the gradual reduction in goods, services and trade facilitation, although the pace of liberalisation is slower than expected [32].

A. Originality of the Research
This research aims to investigate the relationship between demographics, leadership styles and organisational performance which may be mediated by organisational innovation. In particular, the unit of study is hotels in Thailand which has not previously been studied. Hence, the findings of this research can contribute to the body of knowledge for both academic researchers and practitioners.

B. Research Conceptual Framework

![Fig.1 Research Conceptual Framework](image)

**Independent variables:** The demographics of managers, number of employees and leadership styles. At the same time, the levels of innovation created in each organisation were investigated.

**Dependent variable:** Organisational performance; the manager of each hotel was asked to evaluate their financial performance compared with other hotels in their sector.

Figure 1 illustrates the connection between leadership styles, innovation and organisational performance. These concepts are applied to explain the association between leadership styles, organisational innovation and organisational performance, given the unit of study, hotels and their survival in contemporary business in Southeast Asia, especially in Thailand. More specifically, in view of the forthcoming AEC event of 2015, consideration is focused on the continually growing numbers of tourists travelling all around the world. Hence, how to meet customers’ expectations may be needed for the development of organisations.

III. RELATED LITERATURE

Macpherson and Holt [33] found that in small firms like those in the hotel industry, resources are indispensable for opportunity recognition and innovation, while managerial resources are necessary to provide systems and processes to facilitate opportunity exploitation. So, development may be associated with the
Different traits of managers (i.e. gender, age, experience, and education) may lead to different levels of organisational performance. Although a variety of leadership concepts have been introduced [37], Burns [38] proposes that the most promising are transformational and transactional leadership. He suggests that transactional leadership is more commonplace than is transformational leadership, if less dramatic in its consequences. Bass [39], however, further develops the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership. He recognises them as two discrete theories and distinguishes their different features [40]. Bass [41] proposes that transformational managers are likely to make their employees trust, respect, and admire them by focusing on idealised influence, individualised consideration and inspirational motivation which, in turn, imply that they serve as a charismatic role model and express a creative vision. This style of leadership also suggests a need for intellectual stimulation, defined as questioning former assumptions and the status quo [42]. The transformational leadership style describes managers who tend to focus on higher motivation development and motivate their subordinates by inspiring them with a vision of the future [43].

Transformational leadership is composed of the following:
- Intellectual stimulation: encouraging subordinates to question assumptions, discover new ideas and methods, and develop new perspectives;
- Idealised influence: behaviours that subordinates attempt to follow; and
- Individualised consideration: special consideration to each subordinate’s needs for accomplishment and progression.

As in the US economy, almost eighty per cent of Thailand’s economy is service-based, and the quality of service is a major factor in consumers’ perceptions and organisational performance [46]. In order to offer a high-quality service, Dong et al. [47] recommended that firms should concentrate on research and development as a core component of their strategies. Those organisations are on the leading edge of product development or service, and their capability to innovate and introduce new products or services is a new success factor. Innovation has become the most important factor in satisfying demanding consumers in today’s technological world. Ford and Evans [48] also found that organisational innovation could lead to a business to greater levels of performance. However, organisational innovation is no longer strictly the purview of research and development departments; it is imperative for all characteristics of a business and all processes [25]. For example, the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award concentrates on leadership and recognises it as a factor of performance excellence. Similarly, [49] highlight that Motorola’s former CEO, Bob Galvin, made a habit of making quality the first item on the agenda of executive staff meetings, leaving the meeting before discussion of finance. If quality were taken care of, financial performance would follow. His leadership guided Motorola to become one of the first winners of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award [48]. Hence, this suggests that the manager can apply appropriate leadership styles, to encourage organisational innovation and in turn create higher levels of organisational performance.

A. Research Question
The research is designed to answer the question ‘To what extent are the leadership styles of hotel managers supportive of their business through organisational innovation?’ This research question was generated to investigate the relationship between leadership styles, organisational innovation and organisational performance.

IV. Sample and Data Collection
There are approximately 2,400 hotels registered in Thailand [50]. Samples were classified by the stratified random sampling method, ensuring that they were equitably selected with different locations in various provinces. Prior to conducting the questionnaire, postal letters, e-mails, and telephone calls were made to arrange the time and to ascertain that these managers were willing to participate in the survey. Respondents were assured of the confidentiality of their answers.

Questionnaires were distributed to managers of selected hotels. Thailand was chosen to study because it is ranked by the tourists worldwide as one of the most desirable countries to visit [51]. Krejcie and Morgan’s formula is commonly used to determine sample size [52]; their table shows that a population size of 2,400 requires a sample size of at least 331. Correspondingly, Ames [53] suggests that mail surveys are expected to have response rates of 11 to 15 per cent. In
this study, therefore, questionnaires were sent out to 1,000 organisations. A total of 419 completed questionnaires were received, which amounted to a response rate of 41.90 per cent. This is an extremely positive response rate, which could improve the validity of the research and generalisability of the findings. More precisely, Hair et al. [54] suggest that a ratio of 5:1 is the standard to achieve to ensure that the data collected adequately reflects the phenomenon being studied; taking into account all the independent variables, a sample that is at least one-fifth of the target population size is required. Thus, the high response rate could further contribute to the representativeness of the data collected. In this study, nine independent variables were analysed: gender, age, experience, education, number of employees, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership and organisational innovation. In addition, to ensure reliability and validity, a pilot study was tested before conducting the actual questionnaire.

The questionnaire had four sections: demographics, leadership styles, organisational innovation and organisational performance. The first section comprised questions related to gender, age, education and experience, with the number of employees as a controlled variable. The second and third sections used a 1-6 Likert scale [55] where 1 was the least and 6 was the most agreed. In the last section, managers were asked to evaluate their company’s organisational performance by focusing on financial resultsthrough providing a percentage score against other organisations in their sector.

V. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A sequential or hierarchical analysis of a set of independent variables may often produce the coefficients necessary to answer the scientific questions at hand. In the hierarchical form, the set of independent variables is entered cumulatively in the R\(^2\) and partial regression and correlation coefficients are determined when each independent variable joins the others [56]. A full hierarchical procedure for a set of independent variables consists of a series of regression analyses, each with one more variable than its predecessor. The choice of a particular cumulative sequence of independent variables is made in advance, as emphasised by the purpose of the research. Moreover, the researcher should be guided by the theoretical foundation that originally led to the research question [57]. This suggests that the researcher selects the most appropriate independent variables to predict a dependent variable. Therefore, in this section, hierarchical regression analysis is performed to examine the direct effects of Number of Employees, Demographics of Respondents, Leadership Styles and Organisational Innovation on the dependent variable known as Organisational Performance. In accordance with the theoretical framework of this research, Number of Employees and a set of Demographics of Respondents (age, gender, education, and experience) were initially entered, followed by Leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire), and Organisational Innovation. Three hierarchical regression analyses were required to test for Organisational Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model predictors</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R(^2)</th>
<th>Adjusted R(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: Number of Employees, Age, Experience, Gender, Education</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: Transactional Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Laissez-faire Leadership</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3: Organisational Innovation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance

Model 1 (see Table I) with Number of Employees, Age, Experience, Gender, and Education as independent variables, has R\(^2\) = 0.112. This means that those independent variables could explain the dependent variable Organisational Performance, approximately 11.2%. After some independent variables are added to Model 2, R\(^2\) increases to 0.403. Model 3 clearly shows that once the Organisational Innovation is added, R\(^2\) increases to 0.498. Hair et al. [54] recommend that R\(^2\) is the best standard to use when comparing regression models. Therefore, it can be concluded that the set of independent variables in Model 3 is the most valuable in predicting the dependent variable.

A. Hypotheses

H\(_1\): Different demographics lead to different levels of organisational performance.
H\(_2\): Different leadership styles lead to different levels of organisational performance.
H\(_3\): Different levels of organisational innovation lead to different levels of organisational performance.
H\(_4\): The relationship between demographics, leadership styles, and organisational performance are mediated by organisational innovation.

VI. FINDINGS

Rather than looking for a statistical solution, the researcher should be guided by the theoretical foundations that originally led to the research question [57]. This suggests that the researcher selects the most appropriate independent variables to predict a dependent variable. Therefore, in this section, hierarchical regression analysis is performed to examine the direct effects of Number of Employees, Demographics of Respondents, Leadership Styles and Organisational Innovation on the dependent variable known as Organisational Performance. In accordance with the theoretical framework of this research, Number of Employees and a set of Demographics of Respondents (age, gender, education, and experience) were initially entered, followed by Leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire), and Organisational Innovation. Three hierarchical regression analyses were required to test for Organisational Performance.
Moreover, the result of the $R^2$ change in Model 2 suggests that entering a set of Leadership Styles could help explain the variance of the dependent variable, approximately 2.91 or 29.1 per cent, more precisely, and it is also clear that a set of Leadership Styles greatly affects the variance of Organisational Performance. In Model 3, $R^2$ change = 0.094 or 9.4 per cent, so it could be concluded that a set of Leadership Styles is a more powerful influence on Organisational Performance than on Organisational Innovation.

$H_0$: $\beta_1 = \beta_2 \ldots = \beta_k = 0$, there is no significant linear relationship between the set of predictors composed of Number of Employees, Age, Gender, Education, Experience, Transformational, Transactional, Laissez-faire Leadership, Organisational Innovation and the dependent variable, Organisational Performance.

$H_1$: $\beta_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, 2 \ldots k$, there is a significant linear relationship between the set of predictors composed of Number of Employees, Age, Gender, Education, Experience, Transformational, Transactional, Laissez-faire Leadership, Organisational Innovation and the dependent variable, Organisational Performance.

The results of ANOVA show a P value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected (see Table I). It could be concluded that Number of Employees, Demographics of Respondents, Leadership Styles, and Organisational Innovation have an impact on Organisational Performance resulting in the acceptance of hypotheses 1 to 3. Once a set of independent variables has an impact on a dependent variable, the prediction equation can be ascertained.

### A. Beta Coefficient

$$Y = \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 \ + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9$$

Where:

- $Y$ = Organisational Performance
- $\beta_i$ = Beta Coefficient
- $X_1$ = Number of Employees
- $X_2$ = Age
- $X_3$ = Gender
- $X_4$ = Education
- $X_5$ = Experience
- $X_6$ = Transformational Leadership
- $X_7$ = Transactional Leadership
- $X_8$ = Laissez-faire Leadership
- $X_9$ = Organisational Innovation

### B. Model Predictors

Organisational Performance = -0.009 (Number of Employees) + 0.168 (Age) - 0.005 (Gender) + 0.075 (Education) - 0.002 (Experience) + 0.397 (Transformational Leadership) + 0.111 (Transactional Leadership) - 0.058 (Laissez-faire Leadership) + 0.322 (Organisational Innovation)

The most powerful predictor in the Standardised Coefficient Equation is Transformational Leadership (Beta Coefficient = 0.397). This indicates that Transformational Leadership has a positive relationship with Organisational Performance. Hence, it could be supposed that managers who have a high level of Transformational Leadership are supportive to the organisation. Organisational Innovation (Beta Coefficient = 0.322) has a positive relationship with Organisational Performance, suggesting that the managers who have encouraged a high level of Organisational Innovation are useful to the organisation. The Beta Coefficient of Age, 0.168, suggests that it has a positive relationship with Organisational Performance and that the older the managers are, the greater the performance of the organisation could be. However, the Beta Coefficient of Transactional Leadership is 0.111, meaning that Transactional Leadership is another predictor which has a positive relationship with Organisational Performance. It is almost four times less powerful to the Organisational Performance than is Transformational Leadership, and it can be supposed that managers in this category are supportive to the organisation. Similarly, the Beta Coefficient of Education is positive, 0.075, suggesting that Education is also helpful to the organisation.

In addition, the Beta Coefficient of Laissez-faire Leadership is -0.058. This suggests that it has a negative relationship with Organisational Performance. Hence, it could be supposed that the lower the level of this leadership style, the better the manager could perform. Next, the Beta Coefficient of Number of Employees is -0.009, suggesting a negative relationship with Organisational Performance. So, it can be supposed that organisations with a smaller number of employees may perform better than those with a larger number of employees.

Next, the Beta Coefficient of Gender is -0.005, suggesting that male managers perform slightly better than female managers; however, this is largely irrelevant when compared to other variables. Last, the Beta Coefficient of Experience is -0.002, suggesting a negative relationship with Organisational Performance and that the manager with less experience may perform better.
C. Mediation Testing

Table II: Coefficient (Standardised Coefficients of 1st and 2nd Equations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients (1st Equation)</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients (2nd Equation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Innovation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance

1st Equation: Organisational Performance = a Number of Employees and Demographics of Respondents + a Leadership Styles

2nd Equation: Organisational Performance = a Number of Employees and Demographics of Respondents + a Leadership Styles + a Organisational Innovation

Hair et al. [54] strongly suggest the adjusted R² in comparing models with different numbers of independent variables. The adjusted R² is also useful in comparing models with different data sets because it will compensate for the different sample size. Hence, in this research, the adjusted R² is considered for comparing two equations. It was found that adjusted R² for the second equation is 0.487, which is greater than the adjusted R² of the first equation, 0.392. This indicates that the set of independent variables in the second equation explains the dependent variables more fully than the set of independent variables in the first equation. In addition, when adding the Organisational Innovation variable into the equations, the Beta Coefficient values of the Leadership Styles variables change. This suggests that the effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance is mediated by Organisational Innovation. Hence, hypothesis 4 was accepted. It can be concluded that the relationship between demographics of managers, leadership styles, and organisational performance are mediated by organisational innovation.

VII. Recommendations

The results suggest that the set of predictors is statistically associated with the dependent variable. Moreover, findings indicate that managers’ demographics, leadership styles and organisational performance were mediated by organisational innovation. This suggests that it may be necessary to further investigate the extent to which leadership can or cannot be trained to sustain organisational innovation.

Furthermore, the findings underline the fact that transformational and transactional leadership are associated with organisational performance. Hence, organisations may need to provide leadership programmes to encourage their managers to practise the predominant components of those leadership styles (i.e. encouraging through both on-the-job and off-the-job training; see for example, [59]). Effective leadership can be achieved through a suitable hospitality leadership development training programme, as the results suggest that organisational innovation acts as a mediator. Therefore, any organisation desiring to improve its organisational performance may need to encourage its managers to maintain organisational innovation. Intrinsically, in encouraging organisational innovation, additional budgets may be required[60].

VIII. Implications and Future Research

There are several implications of these findings. First, the impact of leadership styles on organisational performance may need to be observed over a long period of time in a longitudinal study. Thus, time limitation is one of the difficulties in conducting this research.

Secondly, this research should also be conducted with employees, who have the most influence on customers’ satisfaction; and on how customers perceive the service as organised by hotel managers and executive teams. Managers’ perspectives of leadership styles, organisational innovation and financial performance may not be adequate to fully explain the environment of the hotel industry overall. However, the different perceptions of employees and customers may lead future researchers to attain more insightful information. Thirdly, within a service industry, it appears that customer orientation is important in increasing a hotel’s performance. Tajeddini and Trueman[61] highlighted ‘putting the customers’ interests first’ to achieve long-term profits. Therefore, although it is essential to recruit well-qualified and experienced managers and employees [62, 63], this study may not have fully revealed whether the respondents are...
well-trained, with wide experience in the hospitality industry. In terms of education, it is likely that managers with higher levels of education are better equipped to understand the meaning of customer orientation, as well as being able to put innovative ideas into practice.

Fourthly, as this study relies on the quantitative approach, it may not fully allow for a complete understanding of complex relationships in the organisation. More importantly, the study focuses on a cross-sectional sample of one specific business type, hotels in the hospitality industry, which limits the degree to which the researcher can make causal references regarding hypothesised relationships. Hence, it is essential to complement the quantitative methodology with qualitative methods, for instance in-depth interviews.

Finally, Krull et al. [64] emphasised the importance of cultural differences. For example, an investigation of Korean managers suggested that, contradictory to the self-serving bias, they are likely to accept responsibility for organisational members [65]. The attribution theory was largely based on experiments with US and European organisations [64, 66], while the Korean study recommends paying attention to building attribution theory predictions in non-Western societies, especially in countries with strong collectivist traditions. This is obviously consistent with the study of Hofstede [29], which suggested that Thai managers are more likely to be collectivist, with high uncertainty avoidance and power distance. This indicates that a repetition of this study in different areas and industries may be useful to acquire more in-depth understanding of the attributes of managers in different cultures.

IX. CONCLUSION

This research explains the relationship between the demographics of managers, leadership styles, organisational innovation, and organisational performance. The findings suggest that transformational and transactional leadership are supportive to the organisation. In addition, organisational innovation acts as a mediator between the demographics of respondents, leadership styles and organisational performance. Hence, the empirical findings suggest that the set of predictors in this research can act as guidelines for managers to improve organisational performance overall.
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