

JIMFE - Andi Ina

by Unpak Fakultas Ekonomi

Submission date: 04-Nov-2020 02:36PM (UTC+0900)

Submission ID: 1435692906

File name: JIMFE_-_Andi_Ina.docx (62.99K)

Word count: 5809

Character count: 32005

THE REACTION OF CHARISMATIC AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP TOWARDS MACHIAVELLIANISM IN ORGANIZATIONS

Lorensia¹, Andi Ina Yustina^{2*}, Mila Austria Rayes³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Presiden, Cikarang

Email: a.inayustina@president.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Behavior of Machiavellianism is one of dark triad that have been portray a negative characteristic that could engage with unethical behavior and could reducing the social relationship between staff and upper staff. Other study has found that leadership style could minimize high Machiavellianism in company and the reactions of each leadership style have been warranty to be studied. Transformational and charismatic leaderships are an excellent leadership that could reduce high Machiavellianism. The data was gather by spreading questionnaires to employee of company, 189 respondents' data have been analyzed using SEM-PLS. The results of this study show that charismatic and transformational leadership have negative and significant relation toward Machiavellianism. This study suggests to test some mediator in order to stronger the relationship between those variables.

Keywords: charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, machiavellianism

Article Information

Article history:

JEL Classification

How to cited:

INTRODUCTION

The psychologist said that the behavior of "put everything to reach those goals" is Machiavellianism. In general word to describe Machiavellianism is manipulators who are willing to do anything or put much effort in all means to get and achieve their own goals (e.g., Dahling *et al.* 2009; Jones and Paulhus, 2009). Machiavellianism is one of the "dark triad", the dark triad consists of Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopath where the three of them portray the bad character and have a tendency regarding with self-promotion, emotional coldness, duality and aggressiveness (Paulhus and Williams, 2002). The existing of Machiavellianism (e.g., manipulator and cheater) in the company will create a problem and reduce the social relationship between

staff or upper staff (Gunnthorsdottir *et al.* 2002). However, Machiavellianism not always related to negative attitude or behavior but they also can be related to the positive one, because their character of "goes for anything" as long as they give them the goals that they wanted (Belschak *et al.* 2015).

The recommendation of some research has been identifying to avoid high Machiavellianism (e.g., Dahling *et al.* 2009; Kiazad *et al.* 2010). However, the effort to avoided that in the organization or company is hard, because the person who do the Machiavellianism is capable for doing the manipulation and defrauding their own social environment (Davies and Stone, 2003; McIlwain, 2003) and hardly to identify (Belschak *et al.* 2018). The high Machiavellianism employees were the group of employees which described

as negative creature and they will push the company in the edge of the cliff (e.g., Dahling *et al.* 2009). Therefore, Belschak *et al.* (2015) decided to do study about how to manage Machiavellianism and reducing high Machiavellianism.

There is a research that believes that leadership style might be the solution for managing the Machiavellianism. Belschak *et al.* (2018) have confronted that the effect of leadership might provide the influence of high machiavellianism employee in a positive ways, however the research about machiavellian employees is barely available nowadays and each effects of different leadership styles on machiavellian employees have not discussed much attention to date (Belschak *et al.*, 2018).

According to Wang *et al.* (2011), transformational leadership is one of the most popular topics among other variety of leadership style. Transformational leadership is the type of leader who well in spoken on delivery their company's vision of future (Bass, 1985). Also, transformational leadership may build the team performance and team functional (Burke *et al.* 2006; Schaubroeck *et al.* 2007; Wang *et al.* 2011). According to Reeves-Ellington (1998) one of successful leader who used transformational leadership in his leading is Steve Jobs. Steve Jobs have been famous as an innovator and leader who pushes followers beyond their self-expectation.

This makes transformational leadership has been popular to be studied. For charismatic leadership, Antonakis *et al.* (2012) stated that the gift that rare to be found in peoples with capabilities to communicate and persuasive skill, often says they have magnetic charm. It is suspected that leaders will lead their followers to be effective leadership.

From that main characteristic, charismatic leaders may be seen in capable of sharpness the interpersonal, it is not only capable of getting along with others but also influencing and getting followers to accept their responsibilities happily. Conger (1999) has been stated that charismatic and transformational leadership behavior will give the outcome to followers in the team, such as low conflict, high attachment toward member among team, high compatibility, and high groupthink in team.

Belschak *et al.* (2018) have been examined about the relationship among ethical leadership, machiavellianism, positive social behavior (affiliate organizational citizenship behavior) and negative social behavior (knowledge hiding and emotional manipulation). From the result of prior study, it has found that ethical leadership has a great effect on machiavellianism. Machiavellianism have been reducing the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and increasing the knowledge hiding and emotional manipulation but it was only been occurred while ethical leadership was low. Therefore, Belschak *et al.* (2018) have been recommended to study more about each leadership style in order to help some company for managing the Machiavellianism. This study will used transformational leadership and charismatic leadership as their independent variable. Over this study, the author wants to know the reaction that each leadership style given to machiavellianism.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Machiavellianism in Organization

In psychology field, the definition of Machiavellianism is the negative (dark) triad that happens in organization. That can be refers to the strategy for

some people manipulate others then gain the benefits of that and usually the other's interest is not in line with manipulator (Jones & Paulhus, 2009). Machiavellianism can be categorizing in quantitative trait which mean have a different variety. Regarding with quantitative trait may define that some individuals will representing the manipulation behavior and the other may or may not show their attention to do manipulation, it is depending on the individual itself (Belschak *et al.* 2018).

The characteristics of high Mach employee can be characterized in two which are a solid focus on certain objective and willing to do anything or put much effort in all means to get and achieve their own goals (Belschak *et al.* 2018). However some research in Mach by Dahling *et al.* (2009) believe that the indication of Mach influence by four factors, which have a feeling to doubt the other's trust, willing to linked with manipulation, have an idea that status is the important aspect for them, and have ambition to maintain the personal control over people. In summary, the solid focus on objective will create a strong self-focus and egoism, it leads in the lack of attach and commit toward the organization. An action of "put everything toward the goal, whatever it takes" will linked with the unethical behavior (e.g., manipulation and lying).

The behavior of high Mach can influence the employee performance and create the negative atmosphere in the organization, a black hole in internal. High Mach attend to do the unethical toward other rather than low Mach, cause the decreasing of trust, which means job satisfaction will decrease and then follow by the high turnover of employees. The behaviors of Mach have a similarity scheme with psychopaths; cause their engage in manipulation and

flat charm combined with the emotionless of person will prevent the negative feeling about the unethical action that the person does toward others, in other words that the person have no guilt feeling about the action that eventually will harm people (Wastell and Booth, 2003).

Transformational Leadership

The desire of the subordinates would be aroused by transformational leadership, by that the subordinates would be motivated and focus for the achievements and self-development, while it also worked with the increment working in a team (Bass, 1990a). In this article also said that the subordinates also not concern with the self-interest, the leaders made them too aware with the key issues in team, while it is increasing the confidence of subsidiaries and then moving them to the stage where concerns with the existence to concerning in the achievement, growth and development.

The main conceptual that already stated by some authors (Antonakis *et al.* 2003; Wright *et al.* 2012; Wright and Pandey, 2010) are the ambition that the transformational leaders attend to make subordinates to have a clearly understanding about the vision of organization and followed by subordinates who exceed their own self-interest.

Jensen *et al.* (2016) argue that there are three behavior that relevant with transformational leaders, which leaders tries to establish the goal of organization, what kind of organization would become (vision), share the understanding about the vision between each subordinates and develop the vision into the long-term run. In the other word, that the set of behaviors may create the desire to aim the

development, sharing, sustaining in organization vision.

Charismatic Leadership

The studies that McClelland *et al.*, (1972); McClelland (1975) held were define the type of charismatic leadership, which are personalized and socialized. The personalized have been defined as self-oriented, non-egalitarian, and exploitive (McClelland *et al.* 1972). Otherwise, socialized have been defined as collective oriented, egalitarian, and non-exploitive (McClelland, 1975). In the theory, charismatic leadership is where the leaders avoided the self-interest (e.g., needs, values, preferences, desires and aspirations) to corporate interest and it causes the highly committed of subordinates to stick in the mission, and willingly to make a personal significant sacrifices and perform beyond their own mission or job description.

House (1977) said that the effect of studies in charismatic leadership by some researcher resulting the consistency increment of satisfaction and perform and it leads to the some behavior such as referring to distal rather than proximate goals; Frequently, giving the words which contain of value and moral justifications; be a role model of the value in the vision of company; addressing high performance expectations of subordinates; communicating a high degree of confidence in subordinate's ability to meet such expectations; and performing the behaviors that could arouse the unawareness of achievement and power of subordinates when these motives are specifically relevant to the attainment of the company's visions.

Some researchers mentioned that the charismatic leadership behavior and attributes are engaged between the effectiveness of follower's performance

and positive follower attitudes (Yammarino *et al.* 1997). The characteristic of charismatic leader is the risk taking, goal oriented, high expectation and their emphasis about the vision (House *et al.* 1991; Shamir *et al.* 1993). Charismatic leaders have awareness regarding with the subordinates' needs and emotions, because of that, leaders also create an emotion bond (Bass and Avolio, 1990; Conger and Kanungo, 1998; Salovey and Mayer, 1990). Some researchers stated that they recognize what the important intention of subordinates (Pillai *et al.* 2003).

Hypothesis Development

Charismatic leadership has a power effect on the organization, which may lead the subordinates too in term on committed to their mission (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Tichy and Devanna, 1986). One of the behaviors of charismatic leadership is have a clear idea about the vision of the company that may bring the better understanding in a future state in term of human rights, peace, freedom, order, equality, and attainment of status and privileges that are claimed to be the moral right of subordinates (House, 1977). Additional article that have been wrote by Weber (1947) said that the charismatic leaders give an offer for common solution to major social problems. Therefore, the researcher suggests the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 Charismatic leadership has negative impact on Machiavellianism in organization.

Transformational leadership attends to create a fixed, clear, understandable vision that could lead to the organization to achieve the organization's goals. The element that

has been discussed by Jensen *et al.*, (2016), the behavior to cross checks the vision of organization. It became the behavior of transformational leaders, because leaders expect to see the clear vision as the important driven to the unselfish subordinates. It's necessary to have a clear vision and leaders expect the subordinates aim the goals for the collective interest rather than the self-interest. Therefore, the researcher suggests the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2 Transformational leadership has negative impact on Machiavellianism in organization.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Primary Data Collecting and Processing

The collections of data have been collected using web-survey or online survey in Jakarta. The author has distributed the survey among the employees who willing to fill the question of survey and there is not feedback for the respondent who already filled and sent the survey to the author.

Before spreading the questionnaire, the statements are adjusted for the latent variables (e.g., charismatic leadership, transformational leadership and Machiavellianism) and translated in Indonesian language which this is the native language for Indonesian, that is already being mixed and some of the question being reversed. After the entire task has done, the questioner must be spread to some of President University students who have already followed internship program. They have to fill the survey which to test the understandable of the statement in Bahasa Indonesia at the general situation or perception, the test named pilot test. By doing the pilot test, the author got the feedback from them,

their point of view and from that the author has to adjust or revise the statement until the perception of public is same each other and easy to understand.

Variable and Measurement

Charismatic leadership was measured in six items which have been developed with Cheung *et al.* (2001), adapted to measure charismatic leadership style. While in prior studied, this measurement used a five-point scale, in this study used a seven-point response scale was used (from 1 = strongly disagreed to 7 = strongly agreed) to measure their supervisor's charismatic leadership style. The samples of items are 'My supervisor makes the team members enthusiastic about the project' and 'My supervisor makes me feel good to working with him/her'.

Transformational leadership was measured in an eight items which have been developed with Avolio *et al.* (1999). In this study used a seven-point response scale was used (from 1 = strongly disagreed to 7 = strongly agreed) to rate their supervisor's transformational leadership style. The samples of items are 'My supervisor arouses followers' awareness about what is really important' and 'My supervisor has followers' respect'.

Machiavellianism was measured in a sixteen items which have been developed with Dahling *et al.* (2009). In this study used a seven-point response scale was used (from 1 = strongly disagreed to 7 = strongly agreed) to rate their own behavior towards Machiavellianism. The samples of items are 'I believe that lying is necessary to maintain a competitive advantage over others' and 'The only good reason to talk

to others is to get information that I can use to my benefit'.

Statistical Analysis

The data that author already got would be running into Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with Partial Least Squares (PLS). The software that is used in this study was Warp PLS software (Version 3.0). According to Hair *et al.* (2013) using statistic tools of SEM-PLS give a significant result and SEM could running the data even the sample size of data is small, because of that the author have choose this tools to run the data.

RESULT

Respondents' Profile

The spreading of questioner in this research has been through online which using the google.doc and hand out some of them in application online named LinkedIn. This process of procedure in distribution questioner was based on Dillman (2000). The distribution of questionnaires has been spread to all the company in Indonesia. The questioner

was consisting of indicators (statements) and five questions regarding demographic details (gender, age, position, work experience and industry) of respondent. The distribution of questioner has been done in the whole one month where the total of distribution was 325 respondents. The author has been collected 210 responds in return. The rate of rating of questioner is 64.6% which more than a half. However due to some reasons, the author must drop some of the responds and decrease it into 189 responds. The result has been found that the gender of female and male who responds this questioner almost the same which for male is 49% and female is 51% (rounded). Mostly, the respondent who filled this survey in a range age of 20 – 25 (49.2%), have a work experience about 3 months – 1 year (35.4%) and > 7 years (39.2%), in position of staff (63.5%) and the field industry of service (38.1%). The general picture on the demographic details already place below (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic details

	% of respondents
Gender	
Male	49.2%
Female	50.8%
Age	
20 – 25	49.2%
26 – 31	11.6%
32 – 37	1.6%
38 – 43	11.1%
> 44	26.5%
Work experience	
3 months - 1 year	35.4%
2 - 4 years	18%
5 - 7 years	7.4%
> 7 years	39.2%
Position	
Staff	63.5%

Supervisor	10.6%
Asisten Manager	4.2%
Manager	16.4%
Senior Manager	4.8%
Asisten Direktur	0.5%
Industry	
Manufacture	15.9%
Retail	11.1%
Service	38,1%
E-Commerce	5.8%
Banking	23.8%
Others	5.3%

Validity and Reliability Test

The test of validity and reliability is use to test the construct validity, to test the construct validity, there are a type of it which are convergent validity and discriminant validity. The test of convergent validity is the test that included some of indicator which is reliability, factor of loading, Average Variance Extracted (EVA). The minimum range of loadings is 0.5 and the higher of that; the better it is however ideally the loadings are 0.7 or higher (Hair *et al.* 2013).

In the process of analyzing the data in the tools (SEM-PLS), the result was not good as the author expected. Some of the indicators have lower factor of loading which will make the result of p-value higher. Therefore, some of the indicator's variable will be deleted. Otherwise, if the deletion of the indicator did not give the impact (increment) on AVE and composite reliability, it is better to keep the indicator in. Thus, the author decided that two indicator from charismatic leadership (CL) has a lower factor which is 'My supervisor readily trust his/her judgment to overcome any obstacle' and 'My supervisor Makes the team members enthusiastic about the project'. Latent variable of

transformational leadership (TL) have three indicators that have to deleted which 'My supervisor displays power, confidence and ethics' ' My supervisor centers on value, beliefs and a sense of mission' and 'My supervisor talks positively about the future'. The last is Machiavellianism personality (MP) that has nine indicators to be deleted, the two of them are 'The only good reason to talk to others is to get information that I can use to my benefit' and 'If I show any weakness at work, other people will take advantage of it'.

After all the deletion of some indicator in this study, the data was running again with sixteen (16) indicators. They are shown in Table 1 that from 16 indicators which selected with the author, the highest factor of loading which is greater than 0.8 have found five (5) in this survey, while in the factor loadings of greater than 0.7 have been found ten (10) and rest of it has a factor of loading of 0.5. Since the range of this Average Variance Extracted has higher than 0.550 up to 0.647, this is already exceeded value that should be fulfilled. There are two measurements to assess the reliability which is composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha and the value of them must higher than 0.7 (Sholihin and Ratmono, 2013). Like the

Table 2 have shown that each variable have composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha greater than 0.7 which for Charismatic leadership have 0.851 (composite reliability) and 0.767 (Cronbach alpha), for Transformational leadership have 0.902 (composite reliability) and 0.864 (Cronbach alpha)

and the last is Machiavellianism which have 0.894 (composite reliability) and 0.860 (Cronbach alpha). Therefore, that is the evidence of the reliability which indicate the research is the measurement of the model have qualified convergent validity.

Table 2. Reliability and convergent validity

Latent Variable	Mean	S.D.	Loading
Charismatic leadership - CL (composite reliability = 0.851; cronbach alpha = 0.767; AVE = 0.589)			
CL 2	5,180	1,540	(0.750)
CL 3	5,386	1,718	(0.803)
CL 4	5,556	1,784	(0.747)
CL 5	5,683	1,435	(0.769)
Transformational leadership - TL (composite reliability = 0.902; cronbach alpha = 0.864; AVE = 0.647)			
TL 3	5,593	1,312	(0.784)
TL 5	5,704	1,386	(0.798)
TL 6	5,513	1,500	(0.840)
TL 7	5,619	1,373	(0.806)
TL 8	5,974	1,122	(0.794)
Machiavellianism personality - MP (composite reliability = 0.894; cronbach alpha = 0.860; AVE = 0.550)			
MP 1	2,370	1,670	(0.738)
MP 2	3,270	1,881	(0.552)
MP 4	2,053	1,597	(0.749)
MP 5	1,894	1,523	(0.742)
MP 6	2,175	1,457	(0.828)
MP 14	2,354	1,633	(0.829)
MP 16	3,265	1,785	(0.720)

The other test of construct validity is discriminant validity; was evaluated by comparing the square root of AVE with the correlation between the constructs. According to Fornell and Larcker (1981) that the appropriate of discriminant validity in the research have to had the greater of the square root of AVE rather than the correlation latent

variable which in the same column. In the Table 3, there is already explained that the square root of AVE (diagonal line) have greater than other correlation latent in each column which can be seen that in the variable latent of Charismatic Leadership have a square root if 0.767 which have greater value in the column that have 0.732 and -0.564. With the

sample that already explained before, it is the evident of the appropriate

discriminant validity that have to fulfill in order to have an adequate research.

Table 3. Discriminant validity

	CL	TL	MP
Charismatic leadership	(0.767)		
Transformational leadership	0.732**	(0.805)	
Machiavellianism personality	-0.564**	-0.257**	(0.742)

Diagonal element: square root of AVE; outside-diagonal: correlation latent.

**Significant at $p < 0.01$

Descriptive Analysis

The other things that can be seen in Table 4 were the correlation between the construct. In this research the negative correlation between the two relationships which charismatic leadership and transformational leadership have in Machiavellianism personality. For the negative correlation between charismatic leadership and Machiavellianism personality have the r of -0.564 and p -value < 0.01 and between transformational leadership and Machiavellianism personality have the r of -0.257 and p -value of < 0.01 . The meaning of negative correlation is while the transformational leadership and charismatic leadership were aroused then will make Machiavellianism in the organization decrease and if the two of style leadership is at the minimum, the Machiavellianism will be increase. P -

value was explaining the significant level of this correlation. In this research all the p -value < 0.001 , represent that all the relationship in this model were significant and strong.

In table 4 is already present the means and standard deviation of each variable which can be seen that charismatic leadership have 5.451 of means and 0.161 of standard deviation, transformational leadership have 5.68 of means and 0.139 of standard deviation and the last but not least is Machiavellianism personality which have 2.483 of means and 0.146 of standard deviation. The value of standard deviation is better if they have a small value, therefore the smallest value that they have, the better it is. Cause the distribution of number is in a small range.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics and correlations

	Mean	SD	CL	TL	MP
Charismatic Leadership	5.451	0.161			
Transformational Leadership	5.680	0.139	0.732**		
Machiavellianism Personality	2.483	0.146	-0.564**	-0.257**	

**Significant at $p < 0.01$

Inferential Analysis

This research only has direct effect which has two relationships between the independent variables (charismatic leadership and transformational leadership) and dependent variable (Machiavellianism). The two direct relationships have a significant impact which has a p-value under 0.1. The relationship between charismatic leadership (CL) and Machiavellianism (MP) is negative relationship ($\beta = -0.69$) and on the other hand, the same negative relationship that the transformational leadership (TL) and Machiavellianism (MP) have which is $\beta = -0.18$. In the result have a R^2 of 0.21.

Discussion

As the explanation at the result above (Figure 2), the author could conclude that the first hypothesis is supported where charismatic leadership is negatively given impact to Machiavellianism in organization. In the result, the relationship between these two is negative and significant ($\beta = -0.69$, $p\text{-value} < 0.01$) which that is explained while charismatic leadership was high makes Machiavellianism in the organization decreased. This hypothesis is also supported by Weber (1947) said that the charismatic leaders could gave the solution regarding the social problem that happened in organization which Machiavellianism. In charismatic leadership has two kinds of type which personalized and socialized, in this result can be seen that charismatic leaders tended to socialized which concern to the collective mission rather than personal orientation. This result also supported the statement by House and Howell (1992) that the manner of socialized which not gain other advantage unfairly will make the level of

Machiavellianism in organization low. Nevertheless, these authors have argued that the interaction each other while they have competitive condition could aroused the personal behavior which could increase the Machiavellianism, this is not the same that the result have present. Despite, in this research is not exactly like that. The result in this study presents employees attend not to do something un-proper or unethical in order to achieve their own goals.

Not only hypothesis 1 has been supported, hypothesis 2 also supported where transformational leadership is negatively given impact to Machiavellianism in organization. In the result, the relationship between these two is negative and significant ($\beta = -0.18$, $p\text{-value} < 0.1$) which that is explained while transformational leadership was high makes Machiavellianism in the organization decreased. In this result, presents those transformational leaders have a tendency to increase the awareness of key issues in the team. Leaders will be concern with the deep understanding of vision and mission in organization and it will lead to the stage where subordinates seem figure it out that collective interest more important rather than individual interest.

The findings of this study have result in practical implication, the role of leadership style in organization where can enhance the subordinate's awareness of what should be attained within the team. Besides that, leaders know how to react or manage the environmental which make the subordinates feels nothing towards Machiavellianism between each employee.

CONCLUSION

The research objective in this study is to prove whether charismatic

leadership and transformational leadership are a good type leadership that might be provides to manage high Machiavellianism employees. Apart from that, this study gives knowledge about Machiavellianism which is rare to be studied. From the objective that already set, two hypotheses were built. The respondent of this study is employees in many sector of industry . About 189 data have been run with SEM (WarpPLS 3.0). The result after the data were run is quite good, the two hypotheses was supported. The relationship between the two of direct line towards Machiavellianism is negative which means that while charismatic or transformational leaders were high in organization, Machiavellianism in employees will be decrease.

The sight of this study for implication is to know the role of leadership style in organization where can enhance the subordinate's awareness of what should be attained within the team and also, how to react or manage the environmental which make the subordinates feels nothing towards Machiavellianism. From this study, the author hope may bring the new sight about other leadership style either work on decreasing employee Machiavellianism or not.

This study is not a perfect research and still has any lacks that have to be improved. The result is quite good and significant, both of the hypotheses. However, in hypothesis 2 which is relationship between transformational leadership with Machiavellianism that have $\beta = -0.18$. That means the relationship between the two variables not strong enough, therefore, the author suggests to have a moderator variable which can make the relationship grows stronger such as work engagement,

work engagement has three pieces which in physical, emotional and cognitive. In physical is the energy to use it in work their jobs, in emotional is putting heart to do the jobs and in cognitive is focus in their job and forgetting about everything (May *et al*, 2004). Since this study of Machiavellianism is rare, prior research has stated that the topic of this is warranty to be studied. Therefore, examination towards the area of reaction in different leadership style is guaranteed and in order to assist managers handle the subordinates at organization environment. Experimental research is warrantee to meet a deeper understanding in employee Machiavellianism. Within these recommendations, the author hopes overcome the lacking of this study has.

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Antonakis, J., Day, D. V., & Schyns, B. (2012). Erratum to "Leadership and individual differences: At the cusp of a renaissance". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23 (4), 643-650.
- 11 Avolio, B. J., Bass, B., & 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.

- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990a). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Belschak, F. D., Den Hartog, D. N., & Den Hartog, A. H. (2018). Angels and demons: The effect of ethical leadership on machiavellian employees' work behaviors. *Front. Psychol*, 9 (1082).
- Belschak, F. D., Den Hartog, D. N., & Kalshoven, K. (2015). Leading Machiavellians: how to translate Machiavellians' selfishness into pro proorganizational. *J. Manage.*, 41 (7), 1934–1956.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17 (3), 288-307.
- Cheung, S. O., Ng, S. T., Lam, K. C., & Yue, W. M. (2001). A satisfying leadership behavior model for design consultants. *Int J Project Manage*, 19 (7), 421 - 429.
- Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organization: an insider's perspective on these developing streams of reserach. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10 (2), 145–179.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dahling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G., & Levy, P. E. (2009). The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale. *J. Manage.*, 35 (2), 219–257.
- Davies, M., & Stone, T. (2003). Synthesis: psychological understanding and social skills. In B. R. Slaughter, *Individual Differences in theory of Mind* (305–353). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet survey: the tailored design method*. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39-50.
- Gunnthorsdottir, A., McCabe, K., & Smith, V. (2002). Using the Machiavellianism instrument to predict trustworthiness in a bargaining game. *J. Econ. Psychol.*, 23 (1), 49–66.
- Hair, J., Hult, T., Ringle, C., & Sartstedt, M. (2013). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Larson, *Leadership: The cutting edge* (189–207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and chirsmatic leadership. *Leadership Quaterly*, 3(2), 81-103.
- House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364–96.

- 19 Jensen, U. T., Andersen, L. B., Bro, L. L., Bøllingtoft, A., Eriksen, T. L., Holten, A., et al. (2019). Conceptualizing and measuring transformational and transactional leadership. *Administration & Society*, 51 (1), 3–33.
- 34 Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2009). Machiavellianism. In e. M. Hoyle, *Behavior, Individual Differences in Social* (93–108). New York, NY: Guilford.
- 1 Kiazad, K., Restubog, S. L., Zagenczyk, T. J., Kiewitz, C., & Tang, R. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: the role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. *J. Res. Pers.*, 44 (4), 512–519.
- 16 May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 77 (1), 11–37.
- McClelland, D. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington.
- McClelland, D., Davis, W., R, K., & Wanner, E. (1972). *The drinking man: Alcohol and human motivation*. New York: Free Press.
- McIlwain, D. (2003). Bypassing empathy: a Machiavellian theory of mind and sneaky power. In R. B. & V. Slaughter, *Individual Differences in theory ofMind* (13–38). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- 27 Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *J. Res. Pers.*, 36 (6), 556–563.
- 21 Pillai, R., Williams, E. A., Lowe, K. B., & Jung, D. I. (2003). Personality, transformational leadership, trust, and the 2000 U.S. presidential vote. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14 (2), 161-192.
- 9 Reeves-Ellington, R. H. (1998). Leadership for socially responsible organization. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 19 (2), 97 - 105.
- 3 Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9 (3), 185-211.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the relationship between leader behavior and team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (4), 1020-1030.
- Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivation effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4 (4), 577 - 594.
- 39 Sholihin, M., & Ratmono, D. (2013). *Analisis SEM-PLS dengan WarpPLS 3.0*. Yogyakarta: Andi Publisher.
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The Transformational Leader*. New York: Wiley.
- 8 Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, 36 (2), 223-270.
- Wastell, C., & Booth, A. (2003). Machiavellianism: an alexithymic perspective. *J. Soc. Clin. Psychol.*, 22 (6), 730–744.

38

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

4

Wright, B. E., & Pandey, S. K. (2010). Transformational leadership in the public sector: Does structure matter? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20 (1), 75-89.

Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership,

public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administration Review*, 72 (2), 206-215.

9

Yammarino, F. J., Dubinsky, A. J., Comer, L. B., & Jolson, M. A. (1997). Women and transformational and contingent reward leadership: A multiple-level-analysis perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40 (1), 205-222.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

26%

SIMILARITY INDEX

24%

INTERNET SOURCES

24%

PUBLICATIONS

20%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

pure.uva.nl

Internet Source

2%

2

centaur.reading.ac.uk

Internet Source

1%

3

Submitted to Napier University

Student Paper

1%

4

www.ris.uu.nl

Internet Source

1%

5

yundong-huang.com

Internet Source

1%

6

Reinout E. De Vries. "On Charisma and Need for Leadership", European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 2010

Publication

1%

7

Submitted to Intercollege

Student Paper

1%

8

Submitted to Dublin City University

Student Paper

1%

9	hdl.handle.net Internet Source	1 %
10	Submitted to Universiteit van Amsterdam Student Paper	1 %
11	Submitted to uu Student Paper	1 %
12	www.nassm.com Internet Source	1 %
13	www.blackwellpublishing.com Internet Source	1 %
14	Submitted to uva Student Paper	1 %
15	Submitted to Trinity College Dublin Student Paper	1 %
16	conservancy.umn.edu Internet Source	1 %
17	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	1 %
18	link.springer.com Internet Source	1 %
19	www.springerprofessional.de Internet Source	1 %
20	moralitylab.bc.edu Internet Source	

1 %

21

es.scribd.com

Internet Source

1 %

22

Submitted to President University

Student Paper

1 %

23

Submitted to Higher Education Commission
Pakistan

Student Paper

<1 %

24

Submitted to University of Liverpool

Student Paper

<1 %

25

journals.plos.org

Internet Source

<1 %

26

Submitted to Royal Holloway and Bedford New
College

Student Paper

<1 %

27

Submitted to Manchester Metropolitan
University

Student Paper

<1 %

28

bradscholars.brad.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

29

journals.sagepub.com

Internet Source

<1 %

30

docshare.tips

Internet Source

<1 %

31	mattchoward.com Internet Source	<1 %
32	Eric Wang, Huey-Wen Chou, James Jiang. "The impacts of charismatic leadership style on team cohesiveness and overall performance during ERP implementation", International Journal of Project Management, 2005 Publication	<1 %
33	www.frontiersin.org Internet Source	<1 %
34	Zsofia Esperger, Tamas Bereczkei. "Machiavellianism and Spontaneous Mentalization: One Step Ahead of Others", European Journal of Personality, 2012 Publication	<1 %
35	www.mbacademy.org.uk Internet Source	<1 %
36	Sholihin, M.. "Goal-setting participation and goal commitment: Examining the mediating roles of procedural fairness and interpersonal trust in a UK financial services organisation", The British Accounting Review, 201106 Publication	<1 %
37	sgo.sagepub.com Internet Source	<1 %

38	ellenensher.com Internet Source	<1 %
39	muqtasid.iainsalatiga.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
40	www.allbusiness.com Internet Source	<1 %
41	www.insead.edu Internet Source	<1 %
42	Robert J. House, Jane M. Howell. "Personality and charismatic leadership", The Leadership Quarterly, 1992 Publication	<1 %
43	www.uk.sagepub.com Internet Source	<1 %
44	paclac.org Internet Source	<1 %
45	dl6.globalstf.org Internet Source	<1 %
46	mafiadoc.com Internet Source	<1 %
47	ejournal.lucp.net Internet Source	<1 %
48	etd.ohiolink.edu Internet Source	<1 %

49

eprints.port.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

50

Marylène Gagné, Alexandre J. S. Morin, Kira Schabram, Zhe Ni Wang, Emanuela Chemolli, Mélanie Briand. "Uncovering Relations Between Leadership Perceptions and Motivation Under Different Organizational Contexts: a Multilevel Cross-lagged Analysis", Journal of Business and Psychology, 2019

Publication

<1 %

51

www.aspanet.org

Internet Source

<1 %

52

Katherine J. Klein, Robert J. House. "On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis", The Leadership Quarterly, 1995

Publication

<1 %

53

scholarlyrepository.miami.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

54

Conal Monaghan, Boris Bizumic, Todd Williams, Martin Sellbom. "Two-dimensional Machiavellianism: Conceptualization, theory, and measurement of the views and tactics dimensions.", Psychological Assessment, 2020

Publication

<1 %

55

Submitted to University of New England

Student Paper

<1 %

56

www.beq.co.za

Internet Source

<1 %

57

Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2015.

Publication

<1 %

58

Submitted to University of Northumbria at
Newcastle

Student Paper

<1 %

59

Cristine Hermann Nodari, Daiane Riva de Almeida, Fabiano de Lima Nunes, Jefferson Dobner Sordi, Marta Bez. "Characteristics transferred into simulation-based learning of nursing programs", Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning, 2020

Publication

<1 %

60

doaj.org

Internet Source

<1 %

61

leadership.wharton.upenn.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

62

digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

63

Hakan Erkutlu, Jamel Chafra. "Leader Machiavellianism and follower silence", European Journal of Management and Business Economics, 2019

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off