

Transactional Leadership, Well-Being Support, OCB-Altruism, and Employee Performance: Testing Their Relationship

Sri Handayani ¹⁺, Suharnomo Suharnomo ¹ and Edy Rahardja ¹

¹ Faculty of Business and Economic, Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract: *This study analyzes the relationship between transactional leadership, well-being support, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)-altruism, and employee performance. Data was collected from 212 respondents who worked in the 11 stone milling companies in Central Java Province - Indonesia. By using AMOS 24 software in processing and analyzing the data, the results of this study found that (1) transactional leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance; (2) well-being support has a positive and significant effect on employee performance; and (3) OCB-altruism has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Employees who have high OCB-altruism have a strong psychological attachment to the organization that encourages them to contribute to the organization both formally and informally by displaying their best performance.*

Keywords: Transactional Leadership, Well-Being Support, OCB-Altruisme, Employee Performance

JEL Codes: D22, L20, L25

1. Introduction

The rapid development of the economy and changes in the business environment have led to higher market competition. Under these circumstances, developing appropriate leadership behaviors to cope with an uncertain environment is not easy. Therefore, a leader who can achieve expectations and competitive advantage is urgently needed to improve employee performance further and overall organizational performance (Frangieh & Rusu, 2021; Xie et al., 2018).

In the last few decades, leadership has received much attention from scientists and practitioners in various organizational management (Fries, Kammerlander, & Leitterstorf, 2021; Zafar, Irum, Almulla, Almajid, & Ali, 2021). Several types of leadership styles generally discussed are focused leadership, structural initiation leadership, horizontal/vertical leadership, servant leadership, and transformational and transactional leadership (Bergman, Rentsch, Small, Davenport, & Bergman, 2012). Of the various leadership styles, transformational leadership and transactional leadership are the most popular leadership styles in the field of organizational management (Baafi, Ansong, Dogbey, & Owusu, 2021; Tyssen, Wald, & Spieth, 2014).

Although there are general findings that transformational leadership is more powerful in influencing employee performance than transactional leadership (Abu Nasra & Arar, 2020), this research is more directed toward transactional leadership for several reasons, namely (1) Transactional leadership is one of the most popular leadership styles and has an influence on employee work behavior (Abdelwahed, Soomro, & Shah, 2022); (2) Transactional leadership tends to be based on exchange relationships (economic and social) between leaders and employees, whereas transactional leadership encourages employee motivation through the use of reward systems; (3) Transactional leaders focus on setting clear goals by clarifying the relationship between rewards given and expected performance and providing feedback to keep employees focused on getting their work done. Furthermore, employees give obedience to the leader (by showing work productivity, high loyalty, and commitment to the organization) and receive tangible rewards as a form of appreciation for their contribution to the

* **Corresponding author.** Tel.: +6285343709228; E-mail address: cvningsri186@gmail.com

organization; (4) Referring to the view that the positive influence of transactional leadership on employee performance is rooted in Path-Goal theory (Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2008) and social exchange theory (Young, Glerum, Joseph, & McCord, 2021), this suggests that leaders transactional knowing well about the needs and wants of employees, and clarifying how these needs and wants can be met as a reasonable reward for improving employee performance; and (5) Employees in blue-collar workplaces are relatively less controlled, very sensitive emotionally, and lack self-control, so leaders need to respond with rewards-punishments so that the complexity of the work can be resolved properly. Podsakoff, Bommer, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) assert that reward and punishment from transactional leaders have been considered the main determinants in changing employee attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors to achieve organizational goals and success. When the desired reward (and unwanted punishment) depends on the work result, the employee's personal interest is expected to provide energy and enthusiasm to produce quality performance in accordance with the organization's expectations.

In accordance with the contradictory research results used as the basis for building this research, some of the research gaps include the results of research conducted by Ahmed, Haider, and Alvi (2021); Donkor (2021); Nazarian, Soares, and Lottermoser (2017); Ozcan and Ozturk (2020) prove that transactional leadership has a significant positive effect on employee performance. Meanwhile, the results of other studies show that transactional leadership has a significant negative effect on employee performance (Jia, Chen, Mei, & Wu, 2018; Velu, Manxhari, Demiri, & Jahaj, 2017), and even transactional leadership does not affect employee performance (Baig et al., 2021; Jacobsen, Andersen, Bøllingtoft, & Eriksen, 2021).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Transactional Leadership

Burns (1978) introduced the transactional leadership model. Transactional leadership occurs when a person connects with others to achieve goals, namely through exchanging things of value, whether psychological, economic, or political (Burns, 1978). Burns remarked that while there was a shared objective between the two parties, there was no further development of the connection than the pre-existing benefits exchange. Nor is the relationship "binding" between the leader and the follower in an ongoing effort to achieve a higher goal.

Transactional leaders exchange values with followers to meet conditions that have been agreed upon by both parties, where followers meet the requirements proposed by the leader in exchange for rewards and praise or avoidance of punishment for failing to reach the goal (Ivey & Kline, 2010; Udin, Dananjoyo, & Isalman, 2022). Thus, transactional leadership appears realistic because it focuses on meeting specific goals or objectives (Aarons, 2006; Suhana, Suharnomo, Mas'ud, & Udin, 2019; Udin, Dananjoyo, & Isalman, 2022).

Northouse (2018) states that transactional leaders do not focus on employee personal development but on achieving goals. Transactional leaders focus on clarifying tasks, offering rewards for positive performance, and punishing poor performance that does not match the leader's expectations. Furthermore, transactional leaders also use "power" to influence followers to achieve desired results (Avery, 2004).

According to Bass (1985), transactional leaders motivate employees to achieve the desired results by (a) explaining the targets to be achieved by employees; (b) showing employees how to achieve these targets; (c) evaluating performance; (d) provide feedback on work results; and (e) provide contingent rewards if employees can achieve these targets. Politis (2002) views transactional leaders clarify employees' roles and determine what they must do to achieve the set targets. Leaders will respond to how well employees carry out their responsibilities and decide to reward or punish employees. Thus, transactional leadership can be applied in various situations and encourages employees to adhere to established standards of work practice (Aarons, 2006).

2.2 Well-Being Support

Over the past few years, employee well-being has received much attention from positive organizational psychology scientists. Well-being is a broad concept that has developed as a research topic in recent decades (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002). However, in terms of definition and measurement, employee well-being seems inconsistent because it has been analyzed from various multidisciplinary approaches (Franco-Santos & Doherty, 2017).

Using the conceptualization proposed by Warr in 1987, Grant, Christianson, and Price (2007) define well-being in the workplace as the overall quality of employees' experiences and functioning at work. Grant et al. (2007) concluded that there are three main aspects of employee well-being at work, which include well-being related to physical, psychological, and well-being related to social functioning. However, according to Topp, Østergaard, Søndergaard, and Bech (2015), the psychological well-being of employees is an approach that is often applied in various research fields.

The concept of employee well-being support should include "pleasure" and "purpose" (Robertson & Cooper, 2010). It describes the extent to which employees experience positive feelings at work and the extent to which they feel meaning and purpose in their work. Robertson and Flint-Taylor (2008) view the psychological well-being of employees at work as a psychological state that includes affective and purposive experiences experienced by employees when they work.

Based on the psychological approach, employee well-being includes hedonic well-being and eudemonic well-being (Guest, 2017). Hedonic well-being is defined as pleasure-seeking and pain avoidance, which refers to subjective feelings of well-being. While eudemonic well-being refers to the extent to which individuals perform their functions in totality (I. Robertson & Cooper, 2011).

Organizations can influence the well-being of their employees by modifying dimensions of the organizational context, such as hours worked, assignments, or rewards (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Both employees and organizations can benefit from increased well-being. On the other hand, organizations and employees can experience poor well-being due to negative influences due to having less productive employees, performing poorly, making unfair decisions, and being more vulnerable to absenteeism from work (García-Cabrera, Lucia-Casademunt, Cuéllar-Molina, & Padilla-Angulo, 2018).

2.3 OCB-Altruism

The term "altruism" has been used in various concepts, both in philosophical, biological, psychological, and economic reviews, which aim to introduce conceptual differences in finding the right meaning of altruism (Pol, Weikard, & Ierland, 2012). In an organizational context, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)-altruism is defined as any discretionary behavior to assist a particular person in completing an organizationally relevant task or problem (Organ, 1988; Suwanti & Udin, 2020; Udin & Yuniawan, 2020).

Guinot, Chiva, and Mallén (2015) define altruism as (1) an attempt to improve the welfare of others; (2) voluntary; (3) intentional, which is intended to help others; and (4) not expecting external rewards. Thus, in general, altruism can be defined as a sense of empathy and concern for the welfare of others through acts of voluntary assistance. Altruism encourages individuals to give unconditional help to others (Hwang & Bowles, 2012). Kim, Lee, and Bonn (2016) view that in reciprocal altruism, a person engages in altruistic behavior with the expectation that others will do the same.

A behavior can be said to be altruistic when the behavior is able to provide benefits to others. Altruistic behaviors include entertaining, sharing, telling, and helping behaviors. This can be exemplified through the behavior of comforting depressed people, responding to their emotional needs, sharing interesting things with known and unknown individuals, and helping others to achieve their goals (Lozada, D'Adamo, & Fuentes, 2011).

Altruistic behavior can be direct (Leider, Mobius, Rosenblat, & Do, 2009), indirect (Fiedler & Sarstedt, 2010), and general (Parra-López, Bulchand-Gidumal, Gutiérrez-Taño, & Díaz-Armas, 2011). Immediate altruism occurs when someone helps someone who has helped them. On the other hand,

indirect altruism happens when people assist others who have helped others. The general altruistic behavior manifests itself in sharing knowledge with anyone regardless of the type of person (Ma & Chan, 2014).

Altruism encourages bonds and a shared identity with other members (Fiedler & Sarstedt, 2010). Altruism frequently plays a crucial role in boosting commitment and creating favourable conditions for knowledge exchange in the workplace (Ma & Chan, 2014). Due to their altruistic behavior toward other members, people are more likely to be loyal to an organization. In contrast, people's commitment to membership in a group is influenced by the altruistic behavior they display toward other members. By increasing group attachment and commitment, altruism encourages reciprocal bonding (Chung & Koo, 2012).

According to Islam et al. (2012), altruism forges bonds between employees. Employees experience a sense of intimacy and connection with others they believe to be receptive to and supportive of their needs. Altruism can lead to feelings of empathy and understanding of others' interests, which can strengthen interpersonal relationships and lessen conflict within an organization. Altruism can encourage employees to experiment with new processes or activities, such as dialogue, participatory decision-making, interaction with the external environment, risk-taking, and encouraging learning within the organization (Guinot et al., 2015).

2.4 Employee Performance

Employee performance is related to the productivity level of employee work behavior, which aims to determine whether the work results are in accordance with the expected goals (Yang & Hwang, 2014). In achieving performance, the goals and responsibilities of employees and the organization are measured from the perspective of performance appraisal (Chen & Silverthorne, 2008).

According to Tseng and Huang (2011), employee performance can be measured using several methods, such as work quality, quantity, timeliness, productivity, training effectiveness, employee behavior, and characteristics. Green and Heywood (2008) stated that two aspects influence employee performance: the personal quality of employees, which includes knowledge, skills, capacities, and motives, and the employee work environment that reflects job expectations, performance feedback, workspace, tools, and incentives.

Amarneh, Al-Rub, and Al-Rub (2010) suggest that employee performance comes from the interaction of three factors: skills, effort, and the nature of working conditions. Skills include the knowledge, abilities, and competencies of employees. At the same time, the effort reflects the various activities undertaken to complete the job. Working conditions refer to adapting and adjusting conditions to increase employee productivity.

3. Hypotheses Development

3.1 The Effect of Transactional Leadership on Employee Performance

Bass (1985) states that the dimensions of the transactional leadership style include contingent rewards, active management by exception, and passive management by exception. In transactional leadership, through contingent rewards, leaders can provide employees with material and psychological rewards that depend on their performance, as stated in contractual obligations. Transactional leadership can encourage employee engagement, loyalty, commitment, and performance by providing contingent rewards. Furthermore, through management by exception, transactional leaders are always careful to ensure that employees meet predetermined work standards (Aga, 2016).

Transactional leaders monitor individual employee and team performance to anticipate mistakes and take corrective action when necessary. Transactional leaders also prefer to interact with employees on an exchange basis, where employees are explicitly rewarded according to the achievement of predetermined goals (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Transactional leaders offer extrinsic rewards and corrective

actions to encourage employees to work harder (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008).

Transactional leaders seek to inspire employees by considering their interests of employees through promises, rewards, and praise. Such a leader motivates employees to realize the expected level of performance by helping them recognize responsibility for the task, identify goals and develop the confidence to achieve the expected level of performance (Lo, Ramayah, & Min, 2010). Transactional leadership emphasizes the exchange and reward for necessary action between the leader and employees. This is related to the path-goal theory, where there is a series of bargains and exchanges made by leaders and employees, which can encourage motivation to pursue the goals set (Tyssen et al., 2014). Transactional leadership becomes more precise and effective in achieving the desired results when there is a clear set of goals.

The results of other studies show that transactional leadership style has a significant effect on knowledge-sharing behavior (Masa'deh et al., 2016; Riaz & Khalili, 2014); OCB (Mekpor & Dartey-Baah, 2017; Suliman & Obaidly, 2013); and employee performance (Ahmed et al., 2021; Ma & Jiang, 2018; Ozcan & Ozturk, 2020).

H1: Transactional leadership has a positive effect on employee performance

3.2 The Effect of Employee Well-being Support on Employee Performance

The results of L. Rhoades and R. Eisenberger (2002); Yavas, Karatepe, and Babakus (2010) show that organizational support is positively related to work behavior and attitudes. In their empirical study, Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, and Rhoades (2001) found a positive relationship between perceived organizational support and task performance. Furthermore, the results of Chiang and Hsieh (2012); Miao and Kim (2010) prove that the organizational support felt by employees positively affects the performance they display in the organization.

The concept of employee well-being support in the workplace promotes profits for organizations with a healthy workforce (I. T. Robertson & Cooper, 2010). The dynamics of employee well-being in the workplace are seen as very important in understanding the different domains that influence the quality of life in the workplace. Many studies have been carried out by economists, sociologists, and psychologists to understand employee well-being (Cox, Eaton, Ekas, & Enkevort, 2015).

Currie (2001) views employee well-being in the workplace as related to employees' physical and mental health. This means that employees must work in a stress-free and physically safe environment. Bakke (2005); Anglin et al. (2018) support this view and state that well-being can be associated with promoting an environment that can produce interesting, useful, stimulating, and enjoyable work and proposes that the workplace should be full of joy to promote optimal performance.

Research evidence shows that employees' high levels of physical and psychological well-being play an important role in driving successful performance (Robertson & Cooper, 2010; Verner-Filion, Vallerand, Amiot, & Mocanu, 2017). In the study of Wright and Cropanzano (2004) for 5 years, which examined the relationship between psychological well-being and employee performance, it was found that there was a positive relationship between the level of psychological well-being and employee performance. This study shows that employees with high levels of psychological well-being appear to perform better than employees with low psychological well-being.

H2: Employee well-being support has a positive effect on employee performance

3.3 The Effect of OCB-Altruism on Employee Performance

Researchers have concentrated on the relationship between OCB and employee performance and organizational performance (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002). According to Cohen and Vigoda (2000), and Putri, Udin, and Djastuti (2019), OCB positively affects an organization; namely, it can increase productivity, efficiency, effectiveness, and the allocation of organizational resources.

OCB-altruism is seen as a tendency to think about the welfare and rights of others, feel concerned and empathize with them and act in a way that benefits them (Shahab, Sobari, & Udin, 2018; VanEmmerik, Jawahar, & Stone, 2005). Individuals are seen as more collaborative, empathetic, altruistic, and motivated by showing concern for the welfare of others (Brown et al., 2009; Rynes, Bartunek, Dutton, & Margolis, 2012). Altruistic behavior can help create a positive expectation of the behavior or intentions of others, which can allow the trust to develop among organizational members. Therefore, the presence of OCB-altruism in the organization can help to generate greater organizational trust (Guinot et al., 2015).

OCB-altruism also allows employees to cooperate in business transactions (Diep, Cocquyt, Zhu, & Vanwing, 2016; VanVugt, Roberts, & Hardy, 2007) and provides a mechanism that allows cooperative behavior to occur in the organization (Hardy & VanVugt, 2006), as well as improving employee performance (Reimers, Magnuson, & Chao, 2017). Böhm and Regner (2013) revealed that OCB-altruism encourages individuals to help others (charitable giving) in the public sector. In addition, they prove that the consequences of pro-social activities can improve employee performance.

H3: OCB-altruism has a positive effect on employee performance

4. Research Methodology

This type of research is to test hypotheses to strengthen the theory that is used as a foothold. In this regard, explanatory research emphasizes the relationship between research variables by testing hypotheses (Kumar, 2005).

4.1 Population and Sample

The population in this study were all employees (at the staff, frontline, and supervisor levels) who worked in the 11 registered stone milling companies in Central Java - Indonesia, totaling 1,060 people. The sampling technique in this study used purposive sampling, which is a technique for determining the research sample by considering the considerations of the elements or categories in the research population (Sugiyono, 2010). The sample categories selected in this study are: (a) The research sample has a minimum of 3 years of working experience; (b) The research sample has a minimum education qualification of high school (SMA); (c) The research sample is actively involved in the work.

The distribution of questionnaires in this study was 300 files to employees who worked in 11 stone milling companies in Central Java Province. The data was gathered from October 2021 to February 2022. Based on this, the total number of successfully returned questionnaires was 229 files (response rate of 76.33%).

After the selection process and questionnaire verification were carried out, 17 questionnaire files were unsuitable for processing for several reasons. For example, the questionnaire was not filled out completely and did not meet the requirements of respondents (i.e., it did not include years of service and education level). Therefore, the number of valid and appropriate questionnaires used in this study was 212.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents in this study can be described using several main characteristics, such as gender, age, education level, and years of service. This can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Data of Respondents

No.	Category	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Gender	Male	171	80.66
		Female	41	19.34
2	Age	< 31 years	88	41.51
		31-40 years	82	38.68

		41-50 years	37	17.45
		> 50 years	5	2.36
3	Educational level	SMA	136	64.15
		D3	9	4.24
		S1	64	30.19
		S2	3	1.42
4	Work experience	3-5 years	117	55.19
		6-10 years	58	27.36
		11-15 years	20	9.43
		> 16 years	17	8.02

Table 1 shows that most of the respondents are male, as many as 80.66% (171 people), and the remaining 19.34% (41 people) are female. This indicates that employees who work in stone milling companies are more dominated and in demand by males than females. Females are more likely to face more complex career choices than males, and many females who work in milling companies do not see company management as the right path for them to build a better career.

From the point of view of age, most respondents are under 30 years old, as many as 41.51% (88 people), 38.68% (82 people) are between 31 to 40 years old, 17.45% (37 people) are between 41 to 50 years old, and 2.36% (5 people) are over 51 years old. This shows that employees working in stone milling companies are dominated by individuals under the age of 30, who always appear willing to take risks and listen to others when there are problems in the work and organization.

In terms of education, the majority of respondents are high school educated as much as 64.15% (136 people) and the remaining 30.19% (64 people) have a bachelor's degree, 4.24% (9 people) have D3 education, and 1.42% (3 people) educated S2. In terms of tenure, most respondents have worked between 3 to 5 years; namely, 55.19% (117 people) and the remaining 27.36% (58 people) have worked between 6 to 8 years, as much as 9.43% (20 people)) have worked between 9 to 11 years, and as many as 8.02% (17 people) have worked more than 12 years. This indicates that employees who work in stone milling companies have little work experience as professionals.

4.2 Measures

Transactional leadership is measured using three dimensions: contingent rewards, active management by exception, and passive management by exception. Transactional leadership measurement was adapted from Judge and Piccolo (2004); Bass and Riggio (2006), which involves 10 questions, namely contingent reward (covering 4 questions such as assessing work based on results, being responsible for work achievement, giving rewards, and encouraging work performance), active management by exception (covering 3 questions such as setting standards to work, focusing on work success, and assessing work errors), and passive management by exception (includes 3 questions such as reacting to work problems, correcting work errors, and providing sanctions for work mistakes). All questions have a scale of 1 – 10, where point 1 states "strongly disagree" to 10 points states "strongly agree."

Employee well-being support is measured using 4 question items adapted from Faragher, Cooper, and Cartwright (2004) with a scale of 1 – 10 points, namely ensuring job security, providing decent salaries and benefits, encouraging comfortable supervision, and facilitating a balance between employee's personal life and work.

OCB-altruism is measured using 3 indicators: taking time to help co-workers, volunteering to help co-workers with work-related problems, and giving sincere respect to co-workers. OCB-altruism measurement involves 3 questions adapted from Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, and Lowe (2009) with a scale of 1 – 10 points.

Employee performance in this study was measured using 4 indicators: work quality, quantity, timeliness, and productivity. Employee performance measurement was adapted from Tseng and Huang (2011), which involved 4 questions. All questions have a scale of 1 – 10, where point 1 states "strongly disagree" to 10 points states "strongly agree."

4.3 The Technique of Data Analysis

The data obtained in this study were statistically processed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with the AMOS 24 software package. SEM is a model that allows for testing a more complicated circuit or network model (Hair Jr, Babin, & Krey, 2017). SEM-based analysis techniques are very useful in developing and extending theories, especially when second-order and even third-order factors provide a better understanding of relationships that may not appear at first (Astrachan, Patel, & Wanzanried, 2014).

5. Results

5.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Endogenous Variable

The estimation results of the measurement of the endogenous variable model are shown in Table 2 using the Maximum Likelihood estimation method. The calculation results of the endogenous variable (i.e., employee performance) show that the criteria for RMSEA, CMIN/DF, GFI, AGFI, TLI, CFI, and NFI provide a conformity index that is in accordance with the recommended limits. However, on the criteria for the p-value of chi-square, it is still considered marginal because its value is below the specified limit. Overall, from the various conformity indices, it can be concluded that the measurement model on the proposed endogenous variable is fit or has a good fit because there is seven goodness of fit criteria that have been fit, so there is no need to eliminate indicators from the endogenous variable.

Table 2: Conformity Index of Endogenous Variable Model

The Goodness of fit Index	Cut-off Value	Model Result	Evidence
χ^2 – Chi-Square	68.669	72.235	Expected a small value
df		51	
χ^2 -Significance Probability (P-Value)	≥ 0.05	0.027	Marginal
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.044	Fit
CMIN/DF	≤ 2.00	1.416	Fit
Goodness of Index (GFI)	≥ 0.90	0.947	Fit
Adjusted Goodness of Index (AGFI)	≥ 0.90	0.919	Fit
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	≥ 0.90	0.984	Fit
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	≥ 0.90	0.988	Fit
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	≥ 0.90	0.961	Fit

Based on Table 2, the measurement model of the endogenous variable has met the fit criteria. Therefore, the next analysis stage can be carried out on the validity of endogenous variables to ensure that all indicators are constructs of the latent variables studied.

Table 3: Loading Factor Value of Endogenous Construct

	Estimate
EP1 <--- Employee Performance	0.878
EP2 <--- Employee Performance	0.731
EP3 <--- Employee Performance	0.724

	Estimate
EP4 <--- Employee Performance	0.855

Table 3 shows that the Employee Performance variables' loading factors are more than 0.5. The largest factor loading value is on the EP1 indicator with a value of 0.878, while the smallest factor loading value is on the EP3 indicator with a value of 0.724. So it can be concluded that all indicators that reflect each of these endogenous variables are unified indicators being studied.

5.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Exogenous Variables

The estimation results of the exogenous variable model measurement are shown in Table 4. Contingent reward, active management by exception, and passive management by exception are still included in the exogenous CFA because they are second-order observed data for transactional leadership. The results of the calculation of exogenous variables show that the p values of chi-square, RMSEA, CMIN/DF, GFI, AGFI, TLI, CFI, and NFI have met the criteria of the conformity index according to the recommended limit. Therefore, from the various conformity indices, it can be concluded that the measurement model on the proposed exogenous variable is fit or has good suitability, so it is not necessary to eliminate indicators from exogenous variables.

Table 4: Model Fit Index on Exogenous Variables

The Goodness of Fit Index	Cut-off Value	Model Result	Evidence
χ^2 - Chi-Square	93.945	88.907	Value is small
df		73	
χ^2 - Significance Probability (P-Value)	≥ 0.05	0.099	Fit
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.032	Fit
CMIN/DF	≤ 2.00	1.218	Fit
Goodness of Index (GFI)	≥ 0.90	0.945	Fit
Adjusted Goodness of Index (AGFI)	≥ 0.90	0.921	Fit
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	≥ 0.90	0.989	Fit
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	≥ 0.90	0.991	Fit
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	≥ 0.90	0.954	Fit

Based on Table 4, the exogenous variable measurement model (i.e., transactional leadership, employee well-being support, and OCB-altruism) has met the fit criteria. Therefore, the next analysis stage can be carried out on the validity of exogenous variables to ensure that all indicators are constructs of the latent variables studied.

Table 5: Loading Factor Value of Exogenous Constructs

	Estimate
Contingent Reward <--- Transactional Leadership	0.589
Active Management by Exception <--- Transactional Leadership	0.616
Passive Management by Exception <--- Transactional Leadership	0.329
CR1 <--- Contingent Reward	0.836
CR2 <--- Contingent Reward	0.815
CR3 <--- Contingent Reward	0.818
CR4 <--- Contingent Reward	0.765
AM1 <--- Active Management by Exception	0.762
AM2 <--- Active Management by Exception	0.858

		Estimate
AM3	<--- Active Management by Exception	0.844
PM1	<--- Passive Management by Exception	0.858
PM2	<--- Passive Management by Exception	0.878
PM3	<--- Passive Management by Exception	0.880
EW1	<--- Employee Well-being Support	0.860
EW2	<--- Employee Well-being Support	0.874
EW3	<--- Employee Well-being Support	0.839
EW4	<--- Employee Well-being Support	0.865
OCB1	<--- OCB Altruism	0.905
OCB2	<--- OCB Altruism	0.960
OCB3	<--- OCB Altruism	0.864

Based on the loading factor values in Table 5, the Contingent Reward variables' loading factors are more than 0.5. The largest factor loading value is on the CR1 indicator with a value of 0.836, while the smallest factor loading value is on the CR4 indicator with a value of 0.765. The loading factor of the Employee Welfare Support variable is more than 0.5. The largest loading factor value on the EW2 indicator with a value of 0.874, while the smallest loading factor value on the EW3 indicator with a loading factor value of 0.839. The loading factor of the Active Management by Exception variable is more than 0.5. The largest loading factor value is on the AM2 indicator with a value of 0.858, while the smallest loading factor value is on the AM1 indicator with a loading factor value of 0.762. The Passive Management by Exception variable's loading factor is more than 0.5. The largest loading factor value is on the PM3 indicator with a value of 0.880, while the smallest loading factor value is on the PM1 indicator with a loading factor value of 0.858. So it can be concluded that all the indicators in the exogenous variables are a single indicator being studied.

Table 6: Causality Test Results on the Overall Fit Model

	Unstandardized Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P
Transactional Leadership → Employee Performance	0.226	0.089	2.548	0.011
Employee Well-being Support → Employee Performance	0.291	0.104	2.786	0.005
OCB Altruism → Employee Performance	0.109	0.048	2.263	0.024

Keterangan: *** sama dengan $p < 0.001$

Tabel 7: Standardized Regression Weights

	Standardized Estimate
Transactional Leadership → Employee Performance	0.299
Employee Well-being Support → Employee Performance	0.252
OCB Altruism → Employee Performance	0.141

The explanation of the tested hypothesis on several direct effect coefficients in Tables 6 and 7 can be described as follows.

1. The direct effect of transactional leadership on employee performance shows a p-value of 0.011 ($p < 0.05$), so it can be concluded that transactional leadership significantly affects employee performance. The path coefficient value, which is positive with estimated regression weights of 0.226 and a standardized regression weights coefficient of 0.299, can be interpreted that better transactional leadership will affect employee performance improvement.

2. The direct effect of employee well-being support on employee performance shows a p-value of 0.005 ($p < 0.05$), so it can be concluded that it significantly affects employee performance. The path coefficient value, which is positive with estimated regression weights of 0.291 and standardized regression weights coefficient of 0.252, it can be interpreted that the better the support for employee well-being, it will affect the improvement of employee performance.
3. The direct effect of OCB-altruism on employee performance shows a p-value of 0.024 ($p < 0.05$), so it can be concluded that OCB-altruism significantly affects employee performance. The path coefficient value, which is positive with estimated regression weights of 0.109 and standardized regression weights coefficient of 0.141, can be interpreted that the better OCB-altruism, it affects employee performance improvement.

6. Discussion

6.1 The Effect of Transactional Leadership on Employee Performance

This study found that transactional leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Transactional leaders organize and manage employees through contractual obligations that focus on rewards and punishments for meeting existing performance standards. By using rewards and punishments directly related to performance, transactional leaders can increase employees' sense of autonomy and competence because they feel they are being treated fairly and given the freedom to think about how to complete performance.

Transactional leadership encourages work motivation among employees through a reward system, as well as focusing on setting clear goals by providing positive feedback to keep employees focused on completing assigned tasks. Furthermore, employees obey the leader (by demonstrating high work productivity and organizational commitment) and receive appropriate rewards for their work (for example, in the form of financial benefits).

The results of this study are in line with the findings of previous research, such as Saeed and Mughal (2019), Ozcan and Ozturk (2020), and Donkor (2021), that transactional leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

6.2 The Effect of Employee Well-being Support on Employee Performance

This study found that employee well-being support had a positive and significant effect on employee performance. This finding is consistent with previous research that higher employee well-being support leads to employee satisfaction, which in turn increases employee engagement and better work productivity (Abdullah, Huang, Sarfraz, Ivascu, & Riaz, 2021; Luna-Arocas & Danvila-del-Valle, 2021).

Employee well-being support in the workplace generally includes the organization's attention to the overall quality of the employee's experience and functioning. According to Human Relations Theory, higher employee well-being support, usually based on job satisfaction assessments (cognitively and evaluatively), results in positive organizational behavior. Employees' feelings of high job satisfaction make it possible for them to use their full potential to be totally involved in work, which leads to higher work productivity in the workplace (Johari & Jha, 2020).

Employees with higher levels of job satisfaction with well-being support facilitated by the organization tend to be high-performing and committed to their work. They identify themselves as individuals who are responsible for the success of their work by continuously building job resilience and avoiding burnout and work stress which have an adverse effect on performance (Chen & Fang, 2016; Li & Hasson, 2020).

Employees who get high well-being support from the organization have various aspirations, goals, and hopes to perform the best work in the organization. Therefore, they play a central role in work and organization by using various knowledge, skills, and past experiences and always focusing on

improving work by cultivating positive behavior in the workplace to produce high-quality work (Vereen, Rasdorf, & Hummer, 2016).

6.3 The Effect of OCB-Altruism on Employee Performance

This study found that OCB-Altruism had a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Employees who have high OCB-altruism have a strong psychological attachment to the organization that encourages them to contribute to the organization both formally and informally by showing their best performance. They also tend not to measure and calculate the costs incurred in helping colleagues produce quality work. These findings are in line with the conclusions of previous researchers, such as Dwomoh, Gyamfi, and Luguterah (2019), Sani and Ekowati (2020), Trong, Thuy, Huong, Thanh, and Linh (2021) who prove that OCB-altruism has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

With OCB-altruism, employees can provide positive benefits to co-workers, for example, helping new employees feel more comfortable at work, paying attention and empathy to them, acting in ways that benefit them, and helping co-workers with difficulties at work. Through OCB-altruism, employees share their professional experiences with others, actively help each other solve work-related problems, and avoid conflicts within the organization. This has implications for improving the work performance of each employee for the better and more productive.

7. Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis, findings, and discussion, this study concludes that transactional leadership has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The dimension of transactional leadership that plays the most dominant role is a contingent reward (i.e., on the indicators of Encouraging work performance, Responsible for employee work achievements, Giving awards, and Assessing work based on work results). Active management follows this by exception dimension (i.e., indicators of determining work standards, assessing work errors, and focusing on work success). Then it is followed by the passive management by exception dimension (i.e., on indicators of correcting work errors, providing sanctions for work errors, and reacting to work problems). Transactional leadership is the main driver to improving employee performance in the organization to achieve long-term success of the organization. By using contingent rewards, transactional leadership can increase employee productivity and work quality to appear more innovative and creative in the organization. It also greatly encourages the personal growth of employees and the organization's growth as a whole.

This study also confirms that employee well-being support has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The indicator of employee well-being support that plays the most dominant role is facilitating a balance between work and personal life, followed by ensuring job security, providing decent salaries and benefits, and encouraging comfortable supervision. This finding is consistent with the views in organizational support theory by Linda Rhoades and Robert Eisenberger (2002) and social exchange theory by Liao, Liu, Li, and Song (2019) that provide positive support to employees (for example, providing high and competitive, recognition), able to encourage employees to work hard and produce better performance.

This study further shows that OCB-Altruism has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The indicator of OCB-altruism that plays the most dominant role is volunteering to help co-workers who have work-related problems, followed by taking time to help and giving genuine respect to co-workers. Employees who have high OCB-altruism have a strong psychological attachment to the organization that encourages them to contribute to the organization both formally and informally by showing their best performance.

7.1 Limitations of the Study

Some limitations need to be mentioned in this study. First, this study only explores one business sector in Central Java - Indonesia, namely the stone milling sector. Therefore, it may not be wise to generalize the results and findings of this study to all sectors in Central Java - Indonesia. Second, in terms of respondents' answers to open-ended questions, this study found that around 8% of respondents did not respond to open-ended questions related to the OCB-altruism variable and support for employee well-being in their organization. This is due to respondents' lack of free time to complete the answers to these open-ended questions.

7.2 Suggestions for Future Research Direction

Some suggestions and recommendations need to be presented in this research for the sustainability and effectiveness of future research. Firstly, this study recommends testing the same construct in all sectors (construction, health, education, hospitality, non-profit, and MSME) in Central Java, allowing the entire population to be presented more effectively. Secondly, this study only uses one method of data collection and analysis, namely quantitative. Therefore, future research needs to use mixed methods, namely quantitative and qualitative, so that the results are able to provide a deeper understanding to the reader. Mix methods research needs to be done to analyze and confirm the point of view of top management (namely the director) on employee perceptions of transactional leadership variables and employee welfare support. Lastly, future research needs to examine the role of other leadership styles and other variables (such as leader-follower fit, gender-matched leaders and followers, and individual orientation) that can help improve employee performance. In addition, the longitudinal method will allow a better observation of cause-and-effect relationships between variables. Longitudinal research is considered very important to be carried out in the future to see the consistency of the findings of the influence of leadership interventions on improving employee performance.

8. References

- [1] Aarons, G. A. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership: Association with attitudes toward evidence-based practice. *Psychiatric services*, 57(8), 1162-1169.
- [2] Abdelwahed, N. A. A., Soomro, B. A., & Shah, N. (2022). Predicting employee performance through transactional leadership and entrepreneur's passion among the employees of Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Management Review*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.001>
- [3] Abdullah, M. I., Huang, D., Sarfraz, M., Ivascu, L., & Riaz, A. (2021). Effects of internal service quality on nurses' job satisfaction, commitment and performance: Mediating role of employee well-being. *Nursing Open*, 8(2), 607-619. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop.2.665>
- [4] Abu Nasra, M., & Arar, K. (2020). Leadership style and teacher performance: mediating role of occupational perception. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(1), 186-202. doi: 10.1108/IJEM-04-2019-0146
- [5] Aga, D. A. (2016). Transactional Leadership and Project Success: The Moderating Role of Goal Clarity. *Procedia Computer Science*, 100, 517-525.
- [6] Ahmed, T., Haider, A., & Alvi, B. (2021). Impact of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles on Employee Performance with Mediating Effect of Affective Commitment: A Study of Banking Sector of Pakistan. *Global Management Sciences Review*, VI, 6, 1-11.
- [7] Amareh, B. H., Al-Rub, R. A., & Al-Rub, N. A. (2010). Co-workers' support and job performance among nurses in Jordanian hospitals. *Journal of research in nursing*, 15(5), 391-401.
- [8] Anglin, A. H., Short, J. C., Drover, W., Stevenson, R. M., McKenny, A. F., & Allison, T. H. (2018). The power of positivity? The influence of positive psychological capital language on crowdfunding performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*.

- [9] Astrachan, C. B., Patel, V. K., & Wanzenried, G. (2014). A comparative study of CB-SEM and PLS-SEM for theory development in family firm research. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(1), 116-128.
- [10] Avery, G. C. (2004). *Understanding leadership: Paradigms and cases*: Sage.
- [11] Baafi, F., Ansong, A., Dogbey, K. E., & Owusu, N. O. (2021). Leadership and innovative work behaviour within Ghanaian metropolitan assemblies: mediating role of resource supply. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 34(7), 765-782. doi: 10.1108/IJPSM-01-2021-0005
- [12] Baig, S. A., Iqbal, S., Abrar, M., Baig, I. A., Amjad, F., Zia-ur-Rehman, M., & Awan, M. U. (2021). Impact of leadership styles on employees' performance with moderating role of positive psychological capital. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32(9-10), 1085-1105. doi: 10.1080/14783363.2019.1665011
- [13] Bakke, D. W. (2005). *Joy at work: A revolutionary approach to fun on the job*. Seattle, WA: PVG.
- [14] Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- [15] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City: Mind Garden.
- [16] Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership, second edition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [17] Bergman, J. Z., Rentsch, J. R., Small, E. A., Davenport, S. W., & Bergman, S. M. (2012). The shared leadership process in decision-making teams. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 152(1), 17-42.
- [18] Böhm, R., & Regner, T. (2013). Charitable giving among females and males: an empirical test of the competitive altruism hypothesis. *Journal of Bioeconomics*, 15, 251-267.
- [19] Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505-522.
- [20] Brown, S. L., Smith, D. M., Schulz, R., Kabeto, M. U., Ubel, P. A., Poulin, M., . . . Langa, K. M. (2009). Caregiving Behavior Is Associated With Decreased Mortality Risk. *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 488-494.
- [21] Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- [22] Chen, J.-C., & Silverthorne, C. (2008). The impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(7), 572-582.
- [23] Chen, Y.-M., & Fang, J.-B. (2016). Correlation between nursing work environment and nurse burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in the western region of mainland China. *Hu Li Za Zhi*, 63(1), 87.
- [24] Chiang, C. F., & Hsieh, T. S. (2012). The Impacts of Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Empowerment on Job Performance: The Mediating Effects of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 3, 180-190.
- [25] Chung, N., & Koo, C. (2012). Knowledge sharing in social networking sites for e-collaboration: Identity and bond theory perspective. *The eighteenth Americas Conference on Information Systems*, Seattle, WA.
- [26] Cohen, A., & Vigoda, E. (2000). Do Good Citizens Make Good Organizational Citizens? An Empirical Examination Of The Relationship Between General Citizenship And Organizational Citizenship Behavior In Israel. *Administration & Society*, 32(5), 596-624.
- [27] Cox, C. R., Eaton, S., Ekas, N. V., & Enkevort, E. A. V. (2015). Death concerns and psychological well-being in mothers of children with autism spectrum disorder. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 45(46), 229-238.
- [28] Currie, D. (2001). *Managing Employee Well-Being*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing Oxford Limited.

- [29] Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357-384.
- [30] Diep, N. A., Cocquyt, C., Zhu, C., & Vanwing, T. (2016). Predicting adult learners' online participation: Effects of altruism, performance expectancy, and social capital. *Computers & Education*, 101, 84-101.
- [31] Donkor, F. (2021). Linking Leadership Styles to Employee Performance in the Public Sector Organizations in Ghana: The Role of Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5).
- [32] Dwomoh, G., Gyamfi, L. A., & Luguterah, A. W. (2019). Effect of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour on Performance of Employees of Kumasi Technical University: Moderating Role of Work Overload. *Journal of Management and Economic Studies*, 1(2), 18-34.
- [33] Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 42-51.
- [34] Faragher, E. B., Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S. (2004). A shortened stress evaluation tool (ASSET). *Stress and Health*, 20(4), 189-201.
- [35] Fiedler, M., & Sarstedt, M. (2010). Influence of community design on user behaviors in online communities. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS)*, St. Louis, Missouri.
- [36] Franco-Santos, M., & Doherty, N. (2017). Performance management and well-being: a close look at the changing nature of the UK higher education workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(6), 1-32.
- [37] Frangieh, M., & Rusu, D. (2021). The effect of the carrot and stick transactional leadership style in motivating employees in SMEs. *Revista de Management Comparat International*, 22(2), 242-252.
- [38] Fries, A., Kammerlander, N., & Leitterstorf, M. (2021). Leadership Styles and Leadership Behaviors in Family Firms: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 12(1), 100374. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2020.100374>
- [39] García-Cabrera, A. M., Lucia-Casademunt, A. M., Cuéllar-Molina, D., & Padilla-Angulo, L. (2018). Negative work-family/family-work spillover and well-being across Europe in the hospitality industry: The role of perceived supervisor support. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 26, 39-48.
- [40] 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, 51-63.
- [41] Green, C., & Heywood, J. (2008). Does Performance Pay Increase Job Satisfaction? *Economica*, 75, 710-728.
- [42] Guest, D. E. (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 22-38.
- [43] Guinot, J., Chiva, R., & Mallén, F. (2015). The effects of altruism and relationship conflict on organizational learning. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 26(1), 85-112.
- [44] Hair Jr, J. F., Babin, B. J., & Krey, N. (2017). Covariance-based structural equation modeling in the Journal of Advertising: Review and recommendations. *Journal of Advertising*, 46(1), 163-177.
- [45] Hardy, C. L., & VanVugt, M. (2006). Nice Guys Finish First: The Competitive Altruism Hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(10), 1402-1413.
- [46] Hwang, S.-H., & Bowles, S. (2012). Is altruism bad for cooperation? *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 83, 330-341.
- [47] Islam, T., Anwar, F., Khan, S. U. R., Rasli, A., Norulkamar, U., & Ahmed, I. (2012). Investigating The Mediating Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Between Organizational Learning Culture And Knowledge Sharing. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19(6), 795-799.

- [48] Ivey, G. W., & Kline, T. J. (2010). Transformational and active transactional leadership in the Canadian military. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(3), 246-262.
- [49] Jacobsen, C. B., Andersen, L. B., Bøllingtoft, A., & Eriksen, T. L. M. (2021). Can Leadership Training Improve Organizational Effectiveness? Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment on Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Public Administration Review*, n/a(n/a). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13356>
- [50] Jia, X., Chen, J., Mei, L., & Wu, Q. (2018). How leadership matters in organizational innovation: a perspective of openness. *Management Decision*, 56(1), 6-25.
- [51] Johari, S., & Jha, K. N. (2020). Interrelationship among Belief, Intention, Attitude, Behavior, and Performance of Construction Workers. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 36(6), 04020081. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000851
- [52] 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.
- [53] Kara, D., Uysal, M., Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, G. (2013). The effect of leadership style on employee well-being in hospitality. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 9-18.
- [54] Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 1007-1022.
- [55] Kim, M. J., Lee, C.-K., & Bonn, M. (2016). The effect of social capital and altruism on seniors' revisit intention to social network sites for tourism-related purposes. *Tourism Management*, 53, 96-107.
- [56] Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J. L., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transform leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 744-764.
- [57] Kumar, R. (2005). *Research Methodology-A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners (2nd ed.)*. Singapore: Pearson Education.
- [58] Leider, S., Mobius, M. M., Rosenblat, T., & Do, Q.-A. (2009). Directed Altruism and Enforced Reciprocity in Social Networks. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(4), 1815-1851.
- [59] Li, Z.-S., & Hasson, F. (2020). Resilience, stress, and psychological well-being in nursing students: A systematic review. *Nurse Education Today*, 90, 104440.
- [60] Liao, Z., Liu, W., Li, X., & Song, Z. (2019). Give and take: An episodic perspective on leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(1), 34-51. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000371>
- [61] Lo, M. C., Ramayah, T., & Min, H. W. (2010). Leadership styles and organizational commitments: a test on Malaysia manufacturing industry. *African Journal of Marketing Management*, 1(6), 133-139.
- [62] Lozada, M., D'Adamo, P., & Fuentes, M. A. (2011). Beneficial effects of human altruism. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 289, 12-16.
- [63] Luna-Arocas, R., & Danvila-del-Valle, I. (2021). Does Positive Wellbeing Predict Job Performance Three Months Later? *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 16(4), 1555-1569. doi: 10.1007/s11482-020-09835-0
- [64] Ma, W. W. K., & Chan, A. (2014). Knowledge sharing and social media: Altruism, perceived online attachment motivation, and perceived online relationship commitment. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 39, 51-58.
- [65] Ma, X., & Jiang, W. (2018). Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, and Employee Creativity in Entrepreneurial Firms. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 0021886318764346.
- [66] MacKenzie, S., Podsakoff, P., & Gregory, A. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29, 115-134.

- [67] Masa'deh, R. e., Obeidat, B. Y., & Tarhini, A. (2016). A Jordanian empirical study of the associations among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, knowledge sharing, job performance, and firm performance: A structural equation modelling approach. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(5), 681-705.
- [68] Mekpor, B., & Dartey-Baah, K. (2017). Leadership styles and employees' voluntary work behaviors in the Ghanaian banking sector. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(1), 74-88.
- [69] Miao, R., & Kim, H. G. (2010). Perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and employee performance: An Chinese empirical study. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 3(2), 257-264.
- [70] Nazarian, A., Soares, A., & Lottermoser, B. (2017). Inherited organizational performance? The perceptions of generation Y on the influence of leadership styles. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(8), 1078-1094.
- [71] Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice*: Sage publications.
- [72] Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. USA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- [73] Ozcan, O., & Ozturk, I. (2020). Impact of organizational culture and leadership styles on employee performance: A research study on the banking industry. *Research Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 45-55.
- [74] Parra-López, E., Bulchand-Gidumal, J., Gutiérrez-Taño, D., & Díaz-Armas, R. (2011). Intentions to use social media in organizing and taking vacation trips. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(2), 640-654.
- [75] Podsakoff, P. M., Bommer, W. H., Podsakoff, N. P., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Relationships between leader reward and punishment behavior and subordinate attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors: A meta-analytic review of existing and new research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99(2), 113-142. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.09.002>
- [76] Pol, T. v. d., Weikard, H.-P., & Ierland, E. v. (2012). Can altruism stabilise international climate agreements? *Ecological Economics*, 81, 112-120.
- [77] Politis, J. D. (2002). Transformational and transactional leadership enabling (disabling) knowledge acquisition of self-managed teams: the consequences for performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(4), 186-197.
- [78] Putri, E. R., Udin, & Djastuti, I. (2019). Structural empowerment and service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating roles of innovativeness and job satisfaction. *Quality - Access to Success*, 20(170), 112-117.
- [79] Reimers, V., Magnuson, B., & Chao, F. (2017). Happiness, altruism and the Prius effect: How do they influence consumer attitudes towards environmentally responsible clothing? *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 21(1), 115-132.
- [80] Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 698-714.
- [81] Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.
- [82] Riaz, M. N., & Khalili, M. T. (2014). Transformational, Transactional Leadership and Rational Decision Making in Services Providing Organizations: Moderating Role of Knowledge Management Processes. *Pakistan journal of commerce and social sciences*, 8(2), 355- 364.
- [83] Robertson, I., & Cooper, C. (2011). *Well-being: Productivity and happiness at work*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [84] Robertson, I. T., & Cooper, C. L. (2010). Full engagement: The integration of employee engagement and psychological well-being. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 31(4), 324-336.

- [85] Robertson, I. T., & Flint-Taylor, J. (2008). *Leadership, psychological well-being and organisational outcomes*, in Cartwright, S. and Cooper, C. L. (Eds), *Oxford Handbook on Organisational Well-being*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- [86] Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Margolis, J. D. (2012). Care and compassion through an organizational lens: Opening up new possibilities. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 503-523.
- [87] Saeed, M., & Mughal, Y. H. (2019). Role of transactional leadership style upon performance: Mediating role of culture. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 13(1), 47-57.
- [88] Sani, A., & Ekowati, V. M. (2020). Spirituality at work and organizational commitment as moderating variables in relationship between Islamic spirituality and OCB IP and influence toward employee performance. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 11(6), 1777-1799. doi: 10.1108/JIMA-08-2018-0140
- [89] Shah, S. M. M., & Hamid, A. (2015). Transactional Leadership and Job Performance: An Empirical Investigation. *Sukkur IBA Journal of Management and Business*, 2(2), 69-81.
- [90] Shahab, M. A., Sobari, A., & Udin, U. (2018). Empowering leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating roles of psychological empowerment and emotional intelligence in medical service industry. *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 6(3), 80-91. doi: 10.35808/ijeba/165
- [91] Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [92] Suhana, S., Suharnomo, S., Mas'ud, F., & Udin, U. (2019). Impact of transformational and transactional leadership on knowledge sharing: The moderating role of collectivistic culture orientation. *Opcion*, 35(SpecialEdition24), 584-597.
- [93] Suliman, A., & Obaidly, H. A.-. (2013). Leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in the financial service sector: The case of the UAE. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 5(2), 115-134.
- [94] Suwanti, S., & Udin, U. (2020). Investigating the relationship between person-organization fit, person-job fit, and innovative work behavior: The mediation role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Quality - Access to Success*, 21(176), 36-41.
- [95] Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 84, 167-176.
- [96] Trong, N. D., Thuy, T. T., Huong, G., Thanh, N. T., & Linh, N. P. (2021). Effect of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) on employee performance at Hanoi University Of Science And Technology (HUST), Vietnam. *International Conference on Emerging Challenges: Business transformation and circular economy*, 262.
- [97] Tseng, S. M., & Huang, J. S. (2011). The correlation between Wikipedia and knowledge sharing on job performance. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38, 6118-6124.
- [98] Tyssen, A. K., Wald, A., & Spieth, P. (2014). The challenge of transactional and transformational leadership in projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32, 365-375.
- [99] Udin, U., Dananjoyo, R., & Isalman, I. (2022). The Effect of Transactional Leadership on Innovative Work Behavior: Testing the Role of Knowledge Sharing and Work Engagement as Mediation Variables. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 17(3), 727-736.
- [100] Udin, U., Dananjoyo, R., & Isalman, I. (2022). Transactional Leadership and Innovative Work Behavior: Testing the Mediation Role of Knowledge Sharing in Distribution Market. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 20(1), 41-53. doi: 10.15722/jds.20.01.202201.41
- [101] Udin, U., & Yuniawan, A. (2020). Psychological capital, personality traits of big-five, organizational citizenship behavior, and task performance: Testing their relationships. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(9), 781-790. doi: 10.13106/JAFEB.2020.VOL7.NO9.781

- [102] VanEmmerik, I. H., Jawahar, I. M., & Stone, T. H. (2005). Associations among altruism, burnout dimensions, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Work & Stress*, 19(1), 93-100.
- [103] VanVugt, M., Roberts, G., & Hardy, C. (2007). *Competitive Altruism: Development of Reputation-Based Cooperation in Groups*, in *Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*, Robin Dunbar and Louise Barrett. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [104] Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E., & Pearce, C. L. (2008). The utility of transactional and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction within a path-goal theory framework. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81(1), 71-82.
- [105] Velu, L., Manxhari, M., Demiri, V., & Jahaj, L. (2017). The Influence of Leadership Styles on Employee's Performance. *Vadyba Journal of Management*, 2(31), 59-69.
- [106] Vereen, S. C., Rasdorf, W., & Hummer, J. E. (2016). Development and Comparative Analysis of Construction Industry Labor Productivity Metrics. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 142(7), 04016020. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001112
- [107] Verner-Filion, J., Vallerand, R. J., Amiot, C. E., & Mocanu, I. (2017). The two roads from passion to sport performance and psychological well-being: The mediating role of need satisfaction, deliberate practice, and achievement goals. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 30, 19-29.
- [108] 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, 89-126.
- [109] Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2004). The Role of Psychological Well-being in Job Performance: A Fresh Look at an Age-Old Quest. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33, 338-351.
- [110] Xie, Y., Xue, W., Li, L., Wang, A., Chen, Y., Zheng, Q., . . . Li, X. (2018). Leadership style and innovation atmosphere in enterprises: An empirical study. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 135(10), 257-265.
- [111] Yang, C.-L., & Hwang, M. (2014). Personality traits and simultaneous reciprocal influences between job performance and job satisfaction. *Chinese Management Studies*, 8(1), 6-26.
- [112] Yavas, U., Karatepe, O. M., & Babakus, E. (2010). Relative efficacy of organizational support and personality traits in predicting service recovery and job performances: a study of frontline employees in Turkey. *Tourism Review*, 65(3), 70-83.
- [113] 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. doi: 10.1177/0149206320908646
- [114] Zafar, Q. Z. C., Irum, S., Almulla, A. A., Almajid, A. N., & Ali, S. (2021). Leadership in times of natural crises-a systematic literature review. *Journal of Management Info*, 8(2), 149-165.

Manuscript received: 27.06.2022

Manuscript received in revised form: 07.10.2022

Manuscript accepted: 10.10.2022