International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories
(IJEPT)
ISSN: 2247-7225
Volume 2026, Issue 1

Transformational Leadership and Organisational Outcomes in Myanmar's Private Sector: A Multidimensional Regression Analysis

Amrish Singhal[1], Dr. Suresh Chandra Padhy[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Management, Poornima University, Jaipur (India)

[2]President (Vice Chancellor), Poornima University, Jaipur (India)

Abstract

This study examines the influence of transformational leadership (TL) on three employee-level organisational behaviour outcomes Extra Effort, Perceived Effectiveness, and Satisfaction with Leadership among 384 employees of private-sector organisations in Myanmar, an emerging Southeast Asian economy in which transformational leadership theory remains empirically under-tested. Using a modified 36-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X) administered through a cross-sectional survey, five TL dimensions (Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviour, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration) were entered simultaneously into three multiple regression models. All three models were highly significant ($p < .001$) and explained 77.6%, 83.2%, and 82.9% of the variance in Extra Effort, Perceived Effectiveness, and Satisfaction respectively, with Cohen's f^2 effect sizes (3.46–4.95) far exceeding conventional large-effect thresholds. Intellectual Stimulation was the only dimension significant across all three models, while Idealized Attributes, despite being the most favourably rated dimension descriptively, was not significant in any model — a pattern independently corroborated by an entropy-weighted TOPSIS ranking. Severe multicollinearity among the five TL predictors (VIF = 12.03–17.67) qualifies the interpretation of individual coefficients without undermining the composite model fit. The results bring full-range leadership theory to a previously under-researched Myanmar national context and provide a grounded foundation for organisations in the private sector to invest in leadership development in Myanmar.

Keywords: transformational leadership; Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; organisational behaviour; multiple regression; Myanmar; entropy-weighted TOPSIS

1. Introduction

A key factor that lies behind the performance of an organization, the behavior of its employees and a company's ability to adapt to the ever changing competitive environment is considered to be effective leadership (Burns, 1978; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Since Bass and Avolio (2004) translated TL into the Full Range Leadership Model and the associated instrument, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), transformational leadership (TL) has received continuous empirical research. There are significant international studies demonstrating the connections between TL and job satisfaction, organisational performance and innovation (Alrowwad, Obeidat, Tarhini, & Aqqad, 2017; Boamah, Obeidat, Wong, & Clarke, 2017; Gumuslüoğlu & Ilsev, 2009). Despite its vast amount of literature, empirical studies on TL in the private sector are still limited in Myanmar. While there are a few existing studies on leadership in single organizations or sectors (garment manufacturing, private banking, insurance, private education: Aye Nyein Nyein Thu, n.d., Htin Kyaw Lin, 2024, Htwe Ei Thaw Lwin, 2018, Maurice Thein Than & Vinitwatanakhun, 2021), no existing study has integrated a psychometrically validated, large-sample implementation of the TL survey with a multi-criteria ranking of its constituent dimensions in this context. The successful models of leadership that have been developed in developed and industrialised economies cannot be assumed to be successful in a transitional economy like Myanmar where collectivist and high power distance cultures exist along with new competitive market pressures (Hofstede, 2001). This study directly aims to fill that gap. The present paper presents the results-based empirical core of a larger thesis-length exploration of

how and whether transformational leadership predicts three outcomes of employee-level organisational behaviours: Extra Effort (EE), Perceived Effectiveness (EFF), Satisfaction with Leadership (SAT). Ideals (ID) and Intellectual Stimulation (IS) the related idealised and intellectual aspects of idealised influence.Together with Inspirational Idealized (ID) and Intellectual Stimulated (IS) the idealised and intellectual aspect of idealised influence.

The study is based on the hypothesis that transformational leadership has a significant effect on the employees' Extra Effort, Perceived Effectiveness and Satisfaction with Leadership (H1), and null hypothesis (H0) that it does not have a significant effect. The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 places the study in the context of TL literature and proposes the guiding hypothesis; Section 3 provides a summary of the methodology followed; Section 4 presents the regression analyses results; Section 5 then discusses the results with regard to theory; and Section 6 concludes the paper with implications, limitations and further directions for research. Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individualized Consideration (IC). The study's central objective is to analyse the impact of these five TL dimensions on EE, EFF and SAT among employees of Myanmar's private-sector organisations, and, in doing so, to determine which specific dimensions carry the greatest unique explanatory weight once their joint, highly overlapping contribution is accounted for.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses

Transformational leadership theory has its roots in the work of Burns (1978) who distinguished between transactional and transformational political leadership and adapted the theory to organisational settings and operationalized it by Bass and Avolio (2004). Transformational leaders are defined by Bass and Riggio (2006) as leaders who inspire followers to change by motivating followers, demonstrating exemplary behavior, encouraging followers to innovate, articulating a shared vision, and providing individual support — attributes that are thought to foster followers' willingness to abandon their own self-interest in order to benefit the entire organisation. The Full Range Leadership Model highlights four conceptual components (the “Four I's”) and five empirically identifiable measurable dimensions are derived when Idealized Influence is decomposed into its attributed and behavioural dimensions: Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviour (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individualized Consideration (IC).

There is a significant international body of research relating these TL dimensions to positive organisational outcomes. Gumuslüoğlu and Ilsev (2009) find that TL is positively related to organisational innovation, Boamah et al. (2017) find a positive relationship between TL and job satisfaction and patient-safety outcomes in health care and Alrowwad et al. (2017) find that TL has a positive impact on organisational performance through the mediating role of corporate social responsibility. Inspirational Motivation is believed to manifest itself in the construction of a motivating vision with emotional appeals (Men, Yue, & Liu, 2020); Intellectual Stimulation is within the realm of offering followers new ways to approach their work and think creatively (Ding, Li, Zhang, Sheng, & Wang, 2017); and Individualized Consideration is manifested through personalisation and awareness of individual needs (Zhu, Chew, & Spangler, 2005) within the specific outcome domains that were examined in this study.

One methodological issue that has consistently shown up in the MLQ literature is the low level of discriminant validity found when the five sub-dimensions of the TL are compared with each other, with generally high correlations between dimensions (Avolio et al., 1999; Tejeda et al., 2001; Antonakis et al., 2003). When predictors from the same underlying instrument are entered at the same time into a regression model, coefficients may be over estimated in the standard error estimates because of multicollinearity, but the overall model fit is not affected (Cohen, 1988; Field, 2018) a concern that is pertinent to the analytical approach used in this study and which will be discussed again in the Discussion.

Even in Myanmar, there is limited existing evidence base that focuses on individual sectors such as garment manufacturing, banking, insurance, and private education (Aye Nyein Nyein Thu, n.d.; Htin Kyaw Lin, 2024; Htwe Ei Thaw Lwin, 2018; Maurice Thein Than & Vinitwatanakhun, 2021). The socio-cultural context of

Myanmar is quite different from the Western and East Asian contexts in which the theory of TL and the MLQ were originally developed and validated (Bass & Avolio, 2004), such as Buddhism and collectivist orientations, high power distance, and respect for hierarchical authority. The importance of the five TL dimensions for predicting employee outcomes in this unique cultural and institutional context remains an empirical question, however, that this study aims to answer.

Based on this, the following hypothesis is tested with the following three separate multiple regression models (one for each of the outcomes):

H0: There is no significant impact of transformational leadership on employees' Extra Effort, Perceived Effectiveness, and Satisfaction with Leadership.

H1: There is a significant impact of transformational leadership on employees' Extra Effort, Perceived Effectiveness, and Satisfaction with Leadership.

3. Methodology

3.1 Design and Sample

This study used positivist, deductive and cross-sectional survey design (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2019; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The population included full-time and part-time workers in private sector organisations that had worked in Myanmar for at least six months, who had good English skills, and had a direct reporting manager. As there is no complete sampling frame for the private sector workforce in Myanmar, a non-probability convenience sampling and snowball sampling process was adopted, which included utilizing professional networks as well as HR contacts from over 100 organizations and LinkedIn (Bryman, 2016). Required sample size was calculated using Cochran's (1977) formula for an unknown population ($n = z^2pq/e^2$, with $z = 1.96$, $p = q = 0.5$, $e = 0.05$), yielding a minimum of 384 respondents; the achieved sample, after listwise deletion of incomplete cases, comprised exactly 384 valid responses with no missing data, evenly split between female and male respondents (192 each).

3.2 Instrument

A modified 36 item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X; Bass & Avolio, 2004) was used to assess Transformational leadership and its outcomes. The 20 items measured the 5 TL dimensions (IA, IB, IM, IS, IC; 4 items each), the 12 items measured the 3 outcome constructs (Extra Effort (EE), Perceived Effectiveness (EFF), Satisfaction with Leadership (SAT)), and the 4 items measured the demographic characteristics. Substantive items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree), and composite scores were the mean of the items that comprised each construct. Prior to full-scale administration, a pilot study of 59 respondents was conducted and Cronbach's alpha was calculated as .952 (20-item TL scale) and .957 (12-item outcome scale) confirming the instrument's suitability to be administered in the Myanmar context.

3.3 Analytical Approach

After the instrument reliability (Cronbach's alpha) and distributional adequacy (skewness and kurtosis, based on the sensitivity of formal normality tests at $N = 384$) were verified, three separate multiple regression models were estimated using the SPSS software IBM SPSS Statistics v26, with the five TL dimensions entered as predictors for one outcome variable each (EE_Mean, EFF_Mean, or SAT_Mean). Multicollinearity diagnostics were performed because the five TL dimensions are conceptually related aspects of the same construct, which were first calculated as Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) from the five dimension Pearson correlation matrix, as VIF values were not directly presented in the SPSS regression output. 95% confidence intervals for each unstandardized coefficient (B) were also calculated as $B \pm (\text{t-critical} \times SE)$ with a two-tailed critical value of 1.9663 and $df = 378$. Cohen's f^2 effect sizes were computed as $R^2/(1-R^2)$ for each model and interpreted against Cohen's (1988) conventional threshold of $f^2 \geq .35$ for a large effect. Finally, an entropy-weighted TOPSIS (Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution; Hwang & Yoon, 1981) multi-criteria ranking

was conducted on the absolute standardized coefficients from the three regression models, to triangulate the regression findings through an independent, objectively weighted decision-analytic method.

4. Results

4.1 Reliability, Sample Profile, and Descriptive Statistics

The 36-item instrument demonstrated excellent internal consistency overall (Cronbach's α = .987, N = 384, no missing data) and at the level of each of its eight four-item subscales, all of which exceeded α = .95 (range .954–.975). The achieved sample was mainly young (73.7% under 36 years of age), typically composed of equal numbers of males (50.0%) and females (50.0%), well educated (62.2% graduate qualified) and had a wide range of tenure with the largest reporting period being 1-3 years with their current organisation (31.8%). All nine of the composite variables (five TL dimensions, three outcomes and overall TL) reported values on the five-point scale between 3.89 and 3.96 and had moderate negative skewness ranging from −1.10 to −1.28 and moderate positive kurtosis ranging from .16 to .62; these values supported the use of parametric inferential procedures. Descriptive statistics for the five dimensions of TL and three constructs of outcomes are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Subscale Reliability for the Five TL Dimensions and Three Outcome Constructs (N = 384)

Composite	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach's α
Idealized Attributes (IA)	3.9629	1.2015	-1.279	.620	.956
Idealized Behaviour (IB)	3.9557	1.1852	-1.224	.525	.966
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	3.9349	1.2140	-1.186	.354	.968
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	3.9258	1.1994	-1.189	.383	.964
Individualized Consideration (IC)	3.8919	1.2039	-1.101	.159	.954
Extra Effort (EE)	3.9622	1.2039	-1.196	.361	.957
Perceived Effectiveness (EFF)	3.9121	1.2332	-1.180	.340	.974
Satisfaction with Leadership (SAT)	3.9082	1.2711	-1.181	.208	.975
Overall TL (TL_Mean)	3.9342	1.1730	-1.249	.543	—

Note. Source: Chapter 5, Tables 5.1–5.3 of the underlying thesis. All composites measured on a 1–5 scale; N = 384, no missing data.

Bivariate Pearson correlations (all $p < .001$) among the five TL dimensions ranged from .915 to .958 an exceptionally narrow, high-value range indicating that the five dimensions, although conceptually distinct, were not sharply differentiated empirically by respondents. TL-dimension-to-outcome correlations, while still large, were consistently smaller (.846 to .898), and the overall TL composite correlated with EE, EFF and SAT at .879, .910 and .910 respectively. Variance Inflation Factors derived from the 5×5 TL correlation submatrix ranged from 12.03 (IA) to 17.67 (IC), all substantially exceeding the conventional caution threshold of 10, confirming severe multicollinearity among the five predictors entered jointly into the regression models reported below. This does

not bias overall model R^2 or the omnibus F-test, but it does inflate individual coefficient standard errors and must condition how dimension-level results are interpreted.

4.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

Three multiple regression models were estimated, one each with the 5 TL dimensions as the predictors for 1 outcome variable. The unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) coefficients, t-statistics, and significance level of each predictor in each of the three models are reported in Table 2.

Table 2. Multiple Regression Coefficients for the Five TL Dimensions Predicting Extra Effort, Perceived Effectiveness, and Satisfaction with Leadership

Predictor	EE: B (β)	EE: p	EFF: B (β)	EFF: p	SAT: B (β)	SAT: p
Constant	.416	.000	.168	.068	.027	.776
Idealized Attributes (IA)	.084 (.084)	.321	.021 (.020)	.781	.142 (.134)	.071
Idealized Behaviour (IB)	.213 (.209)*	.038	.175 (.168)	.055	.215 (.200)*	.023
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	.367 (.370)***	.000	.281 (.276)**	.002	.115 (.110)	.217
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	.245 (.245)**	.007	.217 (.211)**	.007	.292 (.276)***	.000
Individualized Consideration (IC)	-.010 (-.010)	.925	.261 (.255)**	.004	.224 (.212)*	.019

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001. B = unstandardized coefficient; β = standardized coefficient. Source: Chapter 5, Tables 5.8–5.10. Model fit statistics reported in Table 3 below.*

The Extra Effort model was highly significant overall, $F(5, 378) = 261.228$, $p < .001$, with the five TL dimensions jointly explaining 77.6% of variance ($R^2 = .776$; adjusted $R^2 = .773$). For the remaining dimensions, we did not find that they correlated significantly with the predictor, Inspirational Motivation (after controlling for the other dimensions): Idealized Attributes (β = .084, p = .321) and Individualized Consideration (β = -.010, p = .925).

The Perceived Effectiveness model was the best-fitting of the three, $F(5, 378) = 373.887$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .832$ (adjusted $R^2 = .830$). Here, Inspirational Motivation (β = .276, p = .002), Individualized Consideration (β = .255, p = .004) and Intellectual Stimulation (β = .211, p = .007) were significant predictors, Idealized Behaviour approached but did not reach significance (β = .168, p = .055), and Idealized Attributes again failed to reach significance (β = .020, p = .781).

The Satisfaction model likewise explained a very large share of variance, $F(5, 378) = 367.025$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .829$ (adjusted $R^2 = .827$). Intellectual Stimulation was the single strongest predictor (β = .276, p < .001), followed by Individualized Consideration (β = .212, p = .019) and Idealized Behaviour (β = .200, p = .023); Inspirational Motivation (β = .110, p = .217) and Idealized Attributes (β = .134, p = .071) were not significant.

4.3 Model Comparison, Effect Sizes, and Hypothesis Testing

Table 3 compares the overall fit statistics and derived Cohen's f^2 effect sizes across the three models.

Table 3. Summary Comparison of the Three Regression Models

Outcome model	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	F (df = 5, 378)	p	Cohen's f^2	Effect size
Extra Effort (EE)	.881	.776	.773	261.228	< .001	3.46	Large
Perceived Effectiveness (EFF)	.912	.832	.830	373.887	< .001	4.95	Large
Satisfaction (SAT)	.911	.829	.827	367.025	< .001	4.85	Large

Note. Cohen's $f^2 = R^2/(1-R^2)$, derived by the authors; all values far exceed Cohen's (1988) large-effect threshold of $f^2 \geq .35$. Source: Chapter 5, Table 5.11.

Across the three models, Intellectual Stimulation was the only TL dimension significant in all three (EE: $\beta = .245$, $p = .007$; EFF: $\beta = .211$, $p = .007$; SAT: $\beta = .276$, $p < .001$), making it the single most robust predictor among the five dimensions. Idealized Attributes, conversely, was not significant in any of the three models, despite being the most favourably rated TL dimension in the descriptive statistics (M = 3.9629, the highest of the five). In the Extra Effort and Satisfaction models, Idealized Behaviour was significant; in the Extra Effort and Effectiveness models, Inspirational Motivation was significant; and in the Effectiveness and Satisfaction models, Individualized Consideration was significant, but essentially non-existent in the Extra Effort model. This is because the above noted severe multicollinearity (VIF = 12.03–17.67) means that which particular dimension is statistically significant in each of these models is dependent on common variance shared between the highly correlated predictors, and lack of significance in a given model does not mean the dimension is substantively unimportant. When using the supplementary entropy-weighted TOPSIS analysis, the three regression models gave the absolute standardized coefficient of the dimensions that were ranked: Inspirational Motivation (CC* = .921) was ranked first, followed by Intellectual Stimulation (CC* = .669), Idealized Behaviour (CC* = .557), Individualized Consideration (CC* = .291), and Idealized Attributes (CC* = .184) last. The results of the independent, objectively weighted ranking confirm the regression results; the dimension that did not have a significant coefficient in any of the models (IA) was ranked last, the dimension significant in all three models (IS) ranked second, and the dimension that had the strongest coeficient (in all models) (IM, $\beta = .370$ for Extra Effort) was ranked first overall.

The decision on the hypothesis testing is summarized in Table 4. There is clear support for the central hypothesis of this study – that transformational leadership has a significant influence on employees Extra Effort, Perceived Effectiveness, and Satisfaction with Leadership.

Table 4. Summary of Hypothesis-Testing Decision

Hypothesis	Statistical basis	Decision
H0: No significant impact of TL on EE, EFF, and SAT	Three regression models, $R^2 = .776–.832$, all F significant at $p < .001$ (Table 3)	Rejected
H1: Significant impact of TL on EE, EFF, and SAT	Cohen's $f^2 = 3.46–4.95$, all "large" by Cohen's (1988) criteria	Accepted

Note. Source: Chapter 5, Table 5.12.

5. Discussion

The results of this study support the main theoretical position of the full range leadership theory (Bass & Avolio, 2004; Bass & Riggio, 2006) that leaders who demonstrate idealised attributes, inspire followers and stimulate their intellect, and attend to their needs, will engender responses and results that go beyond what will be achieved

through transactional exchange alone. The findings from this study lie at the extreme end of what the international TL literature is typically found to report, with each effect measured being over the conventional 'large effect size' threshold of .35 (Cohen, 1988), and indicate that the interpersonal and motivational aspects of the immediate TL may have disproportionate effects on the effort people put in, their evaluative judgments, and their satisfaction within the private sector in Myanmar where formal employee performance-management systems are, in many organisations, still in the process of being developed.

The differentiation between the five dimensions is a more theoretically generative result. Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration proved to be the most consistent positive predictors, whereas Idealized Attributes did not add appreciably in any model. The relationship of each dimension to the specific mechanisms by which it is theorized to influence followers suggests why the effort/effectiveness model dominates the model of leadership as a driver of follower affective and evaluative judgment, and why Intellectual Stimulation is unique and significant across all three follower outcomes, while Individualized Consideration is unique and significant across the evaluative and affective aspects of the follower's experience. The idealised Attributes — the aspect of idealised influence that is attributed — seems, by contrast, to be a common perceptual "halo" that envelops the other four dimensions, following the distinction between the attributed and behavioural dimensions of idealised influence made by Bass and Riggio (2006).

This differential pattern also is significantly different by outcome type. Extra Effort was primarily a motivational outcome, and it was no surprise that there was a strong relationship with Inspirational Motivation as well as Intellectual Stimulation (both of which directly affect followers' motivational level), but no unique relationship with Individualized Consideration (a more relational and developmental behaviour). Perceived Effectiveness and Satisfaction, on the other hand, are evaluative and affective outcomes, where Individualized Consideration's personalised attention is more of a theoretically coherent predictor. The present study is a modest improvement on the tradition of composite-construct, most of the applied TL literature following Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Bommer (1996) and Bass and Avolio (2004) has tended to report only composite effects. The current study's ability to differentiate the five dimensions' contributions, and to do so with two different analytical techniques (regression and entropy-TOPSIS), both producing the same order, is a modest refinement of that composite-construct tradition.

The severe multicollinearity resulting from the high correlations between the five TL sub-scales ($r = .915–.958$) and the high VIF values (from 12.03 to 17.67) of the sub-scales (Avolio et al., 1999; Tejeda et al., 2001; Antonakis et al., 2003) is a pattern that has long been cited as a methodological problem in the wider literature that employs the MLQ. This has two different meanings. First, it does not invalidate the whole group finding that TL shows strong predictive power for employee outcomes, as overall model R^2 or the joint significance of the predictor set is not influenced by multicollinearity among predictors. Second, it does pose a valid discriminant-validity question: did the five theorised sub-dimensions appear as distinct constructs in the eyes of the Myanmar people, or were they more broadly integrated into an impression of the transformational nature of their leader? This caution does not invalidate the finding, corroborated independently by TOPSIS, that Individual beta weights were highest on Inspirational Motivation and lowest on Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration; it does, however, encourage researchers to think of individual beta weights as indicative of relative statistical dominance of these overlapping predictors rather than as definitive estimates of cause, and to recommend in future studies the use of confirmatory factor analysis or structural equation modelling to test the five dimension measurement structure in this context.

Finally, predictor and outcome variables were obtained from the same subjects at the same occasion using self-report, thus allowing the potential of common-method bias to boost the correlations observed (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). It does not mean that the theoretically coherent, dimension-specific pattern

of the results reported above is not true, but it is a reason to interpret the exact size of the regression coefficient rather than its overall direction and their order, with caution.

6. Conclusion, Implications, Limitations, and Future Research

6.1 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to examine the effectual relationship between transformational leadership and employees' Extra Effort, Perceived Effectiveness and Satisfaction with leadership among the private sector employees in Myanmar. The evidence is in: an affirmative and statistically convincing response comes from each of the three regression models, all of which are statistically significant at the $p < .001$ level, collectively explaining between 77.6% and 83.2% of variance in the three outcomes, and with Cohen's f^2 effect sizes (3.46–4.95) well beyond the threshold for the definition of a large effect size. The null hypothesis of no TL effect is rejected and the alternative hypothesis, that transformational leadership significantly and substantially predicts these three outcomes is accepted. The pattern of unique predictive contribution is more consistent among the dimensions, with Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation and Individualized Consideration having the greatest unique predictive contribution, and Idealized Attributes rating best descriptively but having the lowest unique predictive contribution, supported by an independent entropy-weighted TOPSIS ranking.

6.2 Theoretical and Practical Implications

In theory, the study extended full-range leadership theory (Bass & Avolio, 2004) to a national and sectoral context which had largely been under-represented in empirical TL studies, in this case the private sector in Myanmar, and showed that the modified form of the MLQ (Form 5X) can be used reliably and meaningfully in this situation. The differentiated dimension-level results indicate that although the five-factor structure of transformational leadership is conceptually sound, it does not necessarily look like five equally influential, independent levers across all empirical settings but to a greater extent the more behaviourally concrete dimensions vision articulation, intellectual challenge and individualised attention seem to explain more of the variance than the more attribution-based idealised-influence dimension. In the practical sense, the impact of variance explained (77.6% to 83.2% across three distinct outcome variables) represents the fact that leadership behaviour is one of the strongest leverages which private sector organisations in Myanmar have to influence employee effort, employee perceived effectiveness and employee satisfaction. Leadership-development investment in Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration—developing managers who are able to articulate a vision that is clear and compelling; developing managers who can connect with their employees to engage them in creative problem-solving; and developing managers who can provide individualized mentoring and feedback—should be emphasized, but Idealized Influence should remain as part of a complement and not a replacement to an integrated leadership repertoire. Idealised influence should be thought of as belonging to this integrated repertoire, and not as a dimension to be developed, or deprioritised.

6.3 Limitations

The following restrictions qualify these conclusions. The sample was non-probabilistic (convenience and snowball sampling) and the results may not be statistically generalisable to the entire private sector workforce in Myanmar. The predictor and outcome variables were self-reported by the same respondents at the same time, which could have led to common-method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The survey was conducted in English, with the sample limited to those who are proficient in English, and to those who are English-proficient there is a boundary condition on generalisability to those who are not. The cross-sectional design does not allow for determining the direction of causality between transformational leadership and employee outcomes, nor the effects that can be observed over time. Lastly, the five TL predictors were quite highly correlated with each other (VIF = 12.03–17.67), which means that there is only limited confidence in any claim about which of these dimensions of TL is uniquely responsible for a given outcome, although this does not affect the overall, composite-level results.

6.4 Future Research

Future studies should adopt a longitudinal or repeated-measures design to better establish the directionality of the TL–outcome relationship over time and to overcome the limitation of directionality noted above. Further studies should explore other mediating and moderating factors such as psychological empowerment, organisational commitment, organisational culture and trust to better explain the relationship between the specific dimensions of TL and the specific dimensions of outcomes. Because of the concerns found on discriminant-validity, it is recommended that future research apply the five-dimension measurement model of transformational leadership in the Myanmar context using confirmatory factor analysis or structural equation modelling to make a formal model test, which can lead to a dimensional causal conclusion. The common-method-bias limitation could be reduced further by combining the self-reported data for the employees with supervisor ratings or objective HR performance data. Lastly, a large, geographically representative, and probability-based sample of organisations (including organisations outside of the major city areas) and a properly-powered subsample from non-profits would provide clarity on the strength and pattern of the results, thus helping to determine if they are applicable to the wider diversity of the private-sector employment context in Myanmar.

References

[1] Alrowwad, A., Obeidat, B. Y., Tarhini, A., & Aqqad, N. (2017). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational performance via the mediating role of corporate social responsibility: A structural equation modeling approach. International Business Research, 10(1).

[2] Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The Leadership Quarterly, 14(3), 261–295.

[3] Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72(4), 441–462.

[4] Aye Nyein Nyein Thu. (n.d.). Leadership styles and organizational commitment of selected private-owned garment factories in Myanmar. Yangon University of Economics (MERAL repository).

[5] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sampler set (3rd ed.). Mind Garden.

[6] Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[7] Boamah, S. A., Spence Laschinger, H. K., Wong, C., & Clarke, S. (2017). Effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction and patient safety outcomes. ScienceDirect.

[8] Bryman, A. (2016). Social research methods (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

[9] Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row.

[10] Cochran, W. G. (1977). Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). Wiley.

[11] Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[12] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). Sage.

[13] Ding, X., Li, Q., Zhang, H., Sheng, Z., & Wang, Z. (2017). Linking transformational leadership and work outcomes in temporary organizations: A social identity approach. International Journal of Project Management, 35(4), 543–556.

[14] Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). Sage.

[15] Gumusłuoğlu, L., & Ilsev, A. (2009). Transformational leadership and organizational innovation: The roles of internal and external support for innovation. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 26, 264–277.

[16] Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). Sage.

[17] Htin Kyaw Lin. (2024). Importance of emotional intelligence and leadership styles in private banks: A study of Yangon Region in Myanmar. Research Journal of Business and Management, 11(2), 127–137.

[18] Htwe Ei Thaw Lwin. (2018). Leadership styles of managers in private insurance companies in Myanmar. Yangon University of Economics (MERAL repository).

[19] Hwang, C.-L., & Yoon, K. (1981). Multiple attribute decision making: Methods and applications. Springer-Verlag.

[20] Maurice Thein Than, & Vinitwatanakhun, W. (2021). Transformational leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction at St. John's Private High School, Pathein, Myanmar. Scholar: Human Sciences, 13(1).

[21] Men, L. R., Yue, C. A., & Liu, W. (2020). Vision, passion, and care: The impact of charismatic executive leadership communication on employee trust and support for organizational change. Public Relations Review, 46(3), 101927.

[22] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Management, 22(2), 259–298.

[23] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5), 879–903.

[24] Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). Research methods for business students (8th ed.). Pearson.

[25] Tejeda, M. J., Scandura, T. A., & Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendations. The Leadership Quarterly, 12(1), 31–52.

[26] Zhu, W., Chew, I. K. H., & Spangler, W. D. (2005). CEO transformational leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of human-capital-enhancing human resource management. The Leadership Quarterly, 16(1), 39–52.