



Research on the Impact of Leadership Styles Based on Organisational Climate on Employees' Work Performance

Xu Ran, Rozaini Binti Rosli*, Dhakir Abbas Ali

Lincoln University College, Wisma Lincoln, 12-18, Jalan SS 6/12, 47301 Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author's Email: rozaini@lincoln.edu.my

Abstract

Introduction: In the landscape of human resource management's evolution and amidst the significance of leadership, understanding how leadership styles influence employees' work performance is crucial. This research delves into the impacts of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles on tasks and contextual performance, considering the mediating role of the organisational climate. **Methods:** A questionnaire-based survey was conducted from March to May 2024, targeting 16 enterprises in Beijing. Out of the responses, 204 valid questionnaires were collected, with an effective response rate of 87.18%. Scales from previous studies were used to measure leadership styles, organisational climates, and workplace performance. SPSS 22.0 was employed for reliability, validity, correlation, and regression analyses. **Results:** Autocratic leadership negatively impacts work performance, democratic leadership has a positive effect, and laissez-faire leadership shows no significant correlation with work performance. Organisational climate partially mediates the relationship between autocratic and democratic leadership and work performance, with different mediating degrees in task and contextual performance. However, it does not mediate the relationship between laissez-faire leadership and work performance. Autocratic leadership may limit employees' autonomy, reducing work enthusiasm. Democratic leadership encourages participation and enhances performance. The lack of significant impact of laissez-faire leadership might be due to insufficient guidance. Organisational climate plays a crucial role in the leadership-performance relationship, and different leadership styles interact with it variably. **Conclusion:** Leadership styles have distinct effects on work performance. Organisational climate mediates the relationship between autocratic and democratic leadership and work performance, but not for laissez-faire leadership. This research enriches theoretical understanding and provides practical guidance for enterprise managers. However, it has limitations, and future research should expand samples and variables for more comprehensive insights.

Keywords: Leadership Styles; Organisational Climate; Work Performance

Introduction

Among the six modules of human resource management, performance management, as an independent module, is of great significance to employees, managers and enterprises. In recent decades, the methods of evaluating employees' job performance have become increasingly mature and diverse. The development and continuous improvement of assessment tools such as the key performance indicator (KPI) evaluation method, management by objectives (MBO) performance

evaluation method, balanced scorecard and 360-degree performance evaluation show that enterprises are paying more and more attention to employees' job performance. With the rapid development of human resource management, enterprises are transforming from the traditional management model to the new three-pillar management model, namely the shared service center, the center of excellence and the human resource business partner. The ultimate goal is to achieve higher job performance goals for both enterprises and employees. In addition, job performance is also a research hotspot in Organisational management psychology. Researches on related theories such as the two-factor theory, motivation theory and equity theory have always been the focus of researchers. It can be seen that job performance has become a research direction of great concern in the fields of management and psychology.

In the context of rapid globalisation and technological progress, organisations are increasingly focused on enhancing their effectiveness and sustainability. Leadership, as a pivotal element in both academic studies and practical management, plays a crucial role in shaping employee behaviour, motivation, and overall performance. Owotemu, Bernardi, and Nwosu, (2024) in Impact of leadership approaches on Organisational management & economic growth empirically Analysed that transformational leadership style can significantly stimulate employees to think innovatively, which in turn enhances job performance ; Khan *et al.* (2024) in Effect of green human resource management practices on Organisational sustainability: the mediating role of environmental and employee performance, emphasizing the role of transactional leadership in facilitating short-term employee performance with clear goals and reward and punishment mechanisms; Rachmat, Indratjahyo, and Subagja (2023) in The influence of transformational leadership and organisational commitment on employee performance through communication at the commitment on employee performance through communication at the directorate general of budget, directorate general of budget, found that situational leadership style is more flexible and adjustable to the actual situation of the team, effectively improving organisational efficiency. The flexibility to adapt to the actual situation of the team is found to be more effective in enhancing Organisational effectiveness. Together, these studies highlight how different leadership styles affect employee performance and organisational effectiveness and have made the study of leadership behaviour an ongoing priority in management research (Karam *et al.*, 2017).

Research has shown that different leadership styles have different impacts on employee attitudes and behaviours. The theory of transformational leadership proposed by Bass, and Stogdill (1990) has been further validated and expanded by subsequent scholars, such as Wang, Kang, and Choi, (2021), who found in their study that transformational leaders can significantly increase employee job satisfaction and loyalty by constructing a shared vision, which in turn facilitates performance improvement. And according to Xiu, Lv, and van Dierendonck (2024) and others, leaders should choose appropriate leadership styles to help employees clarify their goals and paths according to their characteristics and work environments to improve performance. The influence of leadership style is particularly significant in the key areas of performance, innovation, and teamwork (Zhang, Zhang & Wang, 2024), factors that are critical to organisational success. As organisations face the complexities of the modern business environment, it is becoming increasingly important to explore a variety of leadership styles. As stated by Antonakis (2003), leaders who adapt their style to fit the specific needs of their team and the environment in which they operate tend to create higher levels of employee engagement and productivity.

Organisational climate refers to the environmental attributes that employees can perceive and influence their work attitudes and behaviours (Paek & Lee, 2025). In 1926, Tolman first proposed the concept of "cognitive maps", which means that individuals can perceive their surroundings and form corresponding cognitive maps in their minds to understand the external environment. This concept laid the foundation for the theory of organisational climate, which attracted the attention of many scholars and triggered a new trend in the study of Organisational climate. Aldabbas and Blaique's (2025) study showed that organisational climate can play a positive role in enhancing employees' performance through work engagement. Employees' own characteristics and work environment affect their state of work engagement, as Saeed *et al.*'s (2021) study pointed out that a positive Organisational climate enhances

employees' psychological sense of belonging, which in turn enhances work engagement. In a favourable Organisational climate, employees are easily influenced by their emotions, which to some extent affects their work attitudes and consequently their efficiency (Alghizzawi *et al.*, 2024). Therefore, to some extent, organisational climate affects employee performance. In view of this, this paper will refer to recent related research results, such as Jha, Pal and Sarkar (2024) study on the interaction between leadership style and Organisational climate, to delve deeper into the mediating role of organisational climate when investigating the effects of different types of leadership styles on employee performance.

Theoretical Frameworks

Leadership Styles

According to American scholar Lewin, Lippitt, and White 1939, leadership styles can be categorised as democratic, authoritarian and laissez-faire. This theory has been widely verified and applied in subsequent studies (Jia, Hu & Li, 2022; Zahari, Akbar, and Situmorang, 2024). Among them, in the process of business operation, under the authoritarian leadership, employees can only be forced to obey the leader's arrangement and seldom have their own ideas (Khan *et al.*, 2024). For example, in some manufacturing companies with an authoritarian leadership style in the workshop, employees only mechanically perform tasks and have very little willingness to innovate (Smith *et al.*, 2021). Democratic leadership actively involves subordinates in the decision-making and operational processes of the company, listens to appropriate suggestions, and creates an atmosphere of democracy and equality in the organisation (Owotemu, Bernardi, and Nwosu, 2024). Numerous technology companies have shown that the democratic leadership style stimulates employee innovation and enhances product competitiveness (Wang, Kang, & Choi, 2021). Laissez-faire leadership implies that leaders take a "hands-off" approach to the behaviour of their subordinates, allowing them to do the work on their own and providing help only when necessary (Rachmat, Indratjahyo, and Subagja, 2023). For some creative work teams, laissez-faire leadership has produced high-quality results by giving employees full creative space (Dipboye, 2018). This paper uses Lewin, Lippitt, and White 1939's research to categorise leadership styles into the above three categories to explore their impact on employee performance.

Theories Related to Employee Performance

Blau's (1964) social exchange theory is the cornerstone of employee performance research, which posits that interactions between employees and organisations are rooted in the mutual exchange of resources and benefits. Subsequent scholars have continued to enrich and expand this theory (Khan *et al.*, 2024; Malla & Malla, 2023). This theory emphasises that exchange can include material rewards, such as salary and promotion, as well as non-material rewards, such as emotional support, recognition, and career development opportunities (Marzec, 2023). For example, in a study of multinational corporations, the more emotional support and career development guidance employees perceived from their organisations, the higher their work engagement (Karam *et al.*, 2017). The evaluative nature of such exchanges allows employees to assess the balance between their inputs (e.g., effort and commitment) and the outputs they receive, which informs their decision to continue engaging with the organisation (Antonakis, 2003).

Research suggests that when employees perceive a favourable exchange relationship – in which the rewards received far outweigh the costs incurred – they are more likely to demonstrate higher work engagement and performance (Aldabbas & Blaique, 2025). For example, in a study of high-tech firms, it was found that employees' initiative to take on extra work in response to high rewards drove innovation in the firm (Saeed *et al.*, 2021). Such proactive responses are often characterised by a willingness to contribute beyond basic job requirements, ultimately improving organisational outcomes (Al Maqbali & Khudari, 2024). The implications of social exchange theories in the workplace are far-reaching, as they suggest that fostering positive employee-employer relationships can significantly impact motivation, retention, and overall job satisfaction (Marzec, 2023).

Theories Related to Organisational Climate

Sense-Making Theory

Meaning construction theory explores how employees construct meaning from the work environment to understand and adapt to organisational challenges (White, 1959; Antonakis, 2003). When faced with uncertainty, individuals rely on social information, environmental cues, and interactions with coworkers to interpret their experiences (McNulty *et al.*, 2018). This interpretive process is largely social, as employees engage in discussions that shape collective attitudes and behaviours, promoting a shared understanding of their organisational contexts (Fulton, 2005).

Research in this area emphasises that through meaning construction, employees can develop a shared view of organisational fairness, support, and trust (Aldabbas & Blaique, 2025). This shared interpretation not only influences individual behaviour but also contributes to a cohesive organisational climate (Saeed *et al.*, 2021; Jia, Hu, & Li, 2022). For example, Paek and Lee (2025) and Marzec (2023) found that when team members engage in open dialogues about their experiences, they gradually create a culture of transparency and collaboration, which improves overall performance and job satisfaction. In some project teams, regular experience-sharing sessions promoted a positive organisational climate and enhanced teamwork efficiency (Zhang, Zhang, & Wang, 2024).

Emergence Theory

Emergence theory extends the understanding of how individual experiences and perceptions within an organisation converge into a team- or organisation-level phenomenon (White, 1959). The theory suggests that as individual employees communicate and interact, their unique cognitive, affective, and behavioural traits can converge to form shared group attributes (Alghizzawi, *et al.*, 2024; Banhos, 2024). These emergent characteristics can significantly affect team dynamics, decision-making processes, and overall Organisational performance (McNulty *et al.*, 2018).

Hypotheses

When exploring how leadership styles affect employee performance, understanding the mediating role of organisational climates is crucial. Based on this, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1: Autocratic leadership negatively affects work performance.

H2: Democratic leadership positively affects work performance.

H3: Laissez-faire leadership negatively affects work performance.

H4: Organisational climate mediates the relationship between autocratic leadership and employees' work performance, specifically:

H4a: It mediates between autocratic leadership and task performance.

H4b: It mediates between autocratic leadership and contextual performance.

H5: Organisational climate acts as a mediator between democratic leadership and employees' work performance, with sub - hypotheses:

H5a: It mediates the link between democratic leadership and task performance.

H5b: It mediates the connection between democratic leadership and contextual performance.

H6: Organisational commitment plays a mediating role between laissez-faire leadership and employees' job performance.

H6a: Organisational climate plays an intermediary role between laissez-faire leadership and work performance.

H6b: Organisational climate plays an intermediary role between laissez-faire leadership and work performance.

Methodology

Data Collection

The research employed a questionnaire-based survey conducted between March and May 2024, targeting 16 enterprises in Beijing. Out of the total responses, 204 questionnaires were deemed valid, yielding an effective response rate of 87.18%.

The survey sample's composition is as follows: In terms of gender, male employees make up 41.7%, while female employees account for 58.3%. In terms of age, 25.0% belong to the 18-24 age group, 28.0% to the 25-27 age group, and 47.0% to the 28-30 age group. For educational background, 2.4% have junior college degrees or below, 58.0% hold bachelor's degrees, 39.1% have master's degrees, and 0.5% possess doctor's degrees; in terms of job levels, ordinary employees account for 78.4%, grassroots supervisors account for 13.7%, middle-level managers account for 5.9%, and senior managers account for 2.0%. In terms of working hours, those working for less than 1 year account for 30.3%, those working for 1-3 years account for 45.1%, those working for 3-5 years account for 17.2%, those working for 5-8 years account for 6.4%, and those working for more than 8 years account for 1.0%; in terms of the number of job changes, employees who have never changed jobs account for 58.3%, those who have changed jobs once account for 18.6%, those who have changed jobs twice account for 14.2%, and those who have changed jobs three times or more account for 8.9%.

Variable Measurement

Prior to the formal survey, this research chose 60 employees for a preliminary survey. Subsequently, based on the respondents' opinions, the questionnaire was revised. Regarding the measurement of leadership styles, the scale compiled by White (1959) was adopted, and its scale has been verified to have extremely high internal consistency and validity. There are a total of 16 items, with items 1 to 6 being about autocratic leadership style, items 7 to 11 being about democratic leadership style, and items 12 to 16 being about laissez-faire leadership style. All items are rated using a five-point Likert scale. The three leadership styles are independent variables. Regarding the measurement of Organisational climate, the Organisational climate measurement scale of Zhang, Zhang, and Wang (2024) was referred to. Based on this questionnaire, a total of 12 items were set in this research. Organisational climate is the mediating variable and dependent variable.

When measuring work performance, this research adopted the self-report scale developed by Amjad *et al.* (2021), which has been verified by Wang, Kang, and Choi, (2021) to have excellent reliability and validity. The scale divides work performance into contextual performance and task performance. The three types of performance are dependent variables.

Statistical Methods

In this research, SPSS 22.00 is employed to analyse the sample data. Specifically, reliability and validity tests, correlation analysis, and hierarchical regression analysis are carried out successively for statistical analysis. This sequential approach ensures a comprehensive and systematic exploration of the data, enabling more accurate and reliable research results.

Results

Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

In this research, descriptive statistics and correlation analysis are performed on the main variables (as shown in Table 1). Results indicate that autocratic leadership is significantly negatively correlated with work performance, thus verifying Hypothesis H1. Conversely, democratic leadership shows a significant positive correlation with work performance, validating Hypothesis H2. However, there is no significant correlation between laissez-faire leadership and work performance, meaning Hypothesis H3 remains unverified.

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Coefficients of Main

Variables	Average	Standard Deviation	X1	X2	X3	Z	Y	Y1	Y2
X1	2.47	0.84	1						
X2	3.75	0.87	-0.433**	1					
X3	2.83	0.73	0.136	0.279**	1				

Z	3.35	0.77	-0.134	0.433**	0.123	1			
Y	3.90	0.61	-0.194**	0.477**	0.137	0.564**	1		
Y1	3.98	0.63	-0.205**	0.413**	0.119	0.366**	0.912**	1	
Y2	3.83	0.69	-0.155*	0.462**	0.132	0.659**	0.928**	0.694**	1

Note: ** indicates significant at the 0.01 level, * indicates significant at the 0.05 level, and the same below. X1: Autocratic Leadership; X2: Democratic Leadership; X3: Laissez-faire Leadership; Z: Organisational Climate; Y: Work Performance; Y1: Task Performance; Y2: Contextual Performance

Regression Analysis of Autocratic Leadership, Organisational Climate and Work Performance

As presented in Table 2, autocratic leadership significantly and negatively impacts both the organisational climate (M1, $r = -0.123$, $p < 0.01$) and work performance (M2, $r = -0.141$, $p < 0.05$), further validating Hypothesis H1. Once the organisational climate variable is introduced, autocratic leadership still significantly influences work performance, yet the impact weakens (M3, $r = -0.088$, $p < 0.05$). Simultaneously, organisational climate has a significant positive impact on work performance (M3, $r = 0.432$, $p < 0.01$). This indicates that organisational climate plays a partial mediating role between autocratic leadership and employees' work performance, thus partially verifying Hypothesis H4. When analysing the mediating effect of organisational climate, it is discovered that after autocratic leadership incorporates this factor (M5), its impact on task performance remains significant but is weakened, while organisational climate has a significant positive impact on task performance (M5, $r = 0.281$, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, the organisational climate mediates between autocratic leadership and task performance, partially verifying Hypothesis H4a. Similarly, when autocratic leadership incorporates the mediating variable of organisational climate (M7), its impact on contextual performance becomes insignificant, while organisational climate has a significant positive impact on contextual performance (M7, $r = 0.583$, $p < 0.01$). Suggesting that organisational climate mediates between autocratic leadership and contextual performance, Hypothesis H4b is verified.

Table 2: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Autocratic Leadership, Work Performance and Organisational Climate

Explanatory Variables	Organisational Climate (Z)	Work Performance (Y)		Task Performance (Y1)		Contextual Performance (Y2)	
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7
X1 : Autocratic Leadership	-0.123**	-0.141*	-0.088*	-0.153**	-0.119*	-0.128*	-0.056
Z : Organisational Climate			0.432**		0.281*		0.583**
R^2	0.018	0.038	0.333	0.042	0.158	0.024	0.439
ΔR^2	0.018	0.038	0.295	0.042	0.116	0.024	0.415
F	3.698*	7.931	50.106*	8.854**	18.924*	4.997*	78.575**

Regression Analysis of Democratic Leadership, Organisational Climate and Work Performance

Table 3 shows that democratic leadership significantly and positively impacts both organisational climate (M8, $r = 0.386$, $p < 0.01$) and work performance (M9, $r = 0.335$, $p < 0.01$), thereby verifying Hypothesis H2. Once organisational climate is added, the influence of democratic leadership on work performance remains significant but weakens (M10, $r = 0.201$, $p < 0.01$). Meanwhile, organisational climate has a significant positive impact on work performance (M10, $r = 0.347$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that it plays a partial mediating role between democratic leadership and work performance, thus partially verifying Hypothesis H5. When analysing the mediating effect of organisational climate, it is found that after introducing this factor (M12), democratic leadership still significantly affects task performance, yet the

impact is weakened. At the same time, organisational climate has a significant positive impact on task performance (M12, $r = 0.187$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, it can be concluded that organisational climate plays a partial mediating role between democratic leadership and task performance, partially verifying Hypothesis H5a. Similarly, after adding organisational climate (M14), democratic leadership still has a significant but weakened impact on contextual performance, while organisational climate significantly and positively affects contextual performance (M14, $r = 0.507$, $p < 0.01$). This shows that organisational climate plays a partial mediating role between democratic leadership and contextual performance, partially verifying Hypothesis H5b.

Table 3: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Democratic Leadership, Work Performance and Organisational Climate

Explanatory Variables	Organisational Climate (Z)	Work Performance (Y)		Task Performance (Y1)		Contextual Performance (Y2)	
	M8	M9	M10	M11	M12	M13	M14
X2 : Democratic Leadership	0.386**	0.335**	0.201**	0.300**	0.228**	0.370**	0.174**
Z : Organisational Climate			0.347**		0.187**		0.507**
R^2	0.187	0.227	0.385	0.171	0.214	0.213	0.473
ΔR^2	0.187	0.227	0.158	0.171	0.043	0.213	0.260
F	46.553**	59.402**	62.880**	41.653**	27.340**	54.793**	90.075**

Regression Analysis of Laissez-faire Leadership, Organisational Climate and Work Performance

Regression analysis was conducted on laissez-faire leadership, organisational climate and work performance (see Table 4). In Table 4, X3: Laissez-faire leadership is the independent variable, and the rest are model statistics. The impacts of laissez-faire leadership on them are not significant, and Hypotheses H3, H6, H6a and H6b have not been verified.

Table 4: Regression of Laissez-faire Leadership, Work Performance and Organisational Climate

Explanatory Variables	Organisational Climate	Work Performance	Task Performance	Contextual Performance
	M15	M16	M17	M18
X3 : Laissez-faire Leadership	0.130	0.114	0.103	0.125
R^2	0.015	0.019	0.014	0.013
F	3.104	3.848	2.915	3.575

Discussion

The findings reveal a significant negative correlation between autocratic leadership and work performance, suggesting that this leadership style may hinder employees' ability to perform effectively. This may be because this leadership style restricts employees' autonomy and creativity, leading to a decline in their work enthusiasm and thus affecting work performance (Jia, Hu & Li, 2022). Research by Zahari, Akbar, and Situmorang (2024) indicates that democratic leadership has a notably positive correlation with work performance. Democratic leadership can inspire employees work enthusiasm and initiative, encouraging their participation in decision-making and the work process, which in turn enhances work performance. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership shows no significant correlation with work performance. This might be due to the fact that laissez-faire leadership offers less work guidance and supervision to employees. As a result, employees' work performance is more influenced by other factors, like their own abilities and the working environment.

After introducing the variable of organisational climate, the impact of autocratic leadership on work performance is weakened, and organisational climate has a significant positive impact on work performance. This shows that organisational climate plays a partial mediating role between autocratic leadership and employees' work performance. Specifically, in terms of task performance and contextual performance, organisational climate plays a mediating role between autocratic leadership and task performance and plays a mediating effect between autocratic leadership and contextual performance. This means that autocratic leadership not only directly affects work performance but also indirectly affects it by influencing organisational climate. In particular, the impact on contextual performance is completely achieved through organisational climate. This suggests to enterprise managers that autocratic leadership may undermine the organisational climate and then have a negative impact on employees' work performance, so this leadership style should be adopted with caution (Ghrai, 2024). Organisational climate plays a partial mediating role between democratic leadership and work performance. In terms of task performance and contextual performance, organisational climate also plays a partial mediating role between democratic leadership and them. This indicates that democratic leadership can create a good organisational climate and then improve employees' work performance, including task performance and contextual performance. Enterprises should advocate the democratic leadership style and encourage employee participation to enhance the organisational climate and work performance (Hermanto, Srimulyani & Pitoyo, 2024; Zahari, Akbar & Situmorang, 2024; Alghizzawi *et al.*, 2024). The impacts of laissez-faire leadership on organisational climate, work performance, task performance and contextual performance are not significant, and the hypotheses have not been verified. This may imply that laissez-faire leadership has a relatively small impact on organisational climate and work performance in the context of this research, or its impact mechanism is rather complex and requires further in-depth research.

Limitation

This research may have some limitations. Firstly, although the sample has a certain degree of diversity, it may still not be able to fully represent the situations of all enterprises and industries. This research has limitations. The sample might influence the generality of the results. The self-report scale for work performance has subjective biases due to factors like self-awareness and work attitude. Only the organisational climate was considered a mediating variable; there could be others. Future research should address these to improve conclusion reliability. In future research, it is advisable to broaden the range of mediating and moderating variables. These changes will enable a more comprehensive exploration of the link between leadership styles and work performance, thereby enhancing the understanding of how different leadership approaches impact employees' job performance.

In the future, research can be extended and delved deeper in multiple ways. Initially, broaden the sample scope by including a wider variety of enterprises and industries, thereby increasing the generalisability of the research outcomes. Second, adopt a combination of multiple measurement methods to evaluate work performance, such as combining evaluations from superiors and colleagues to reduce subjective biases. Third, further explore other possible mediating variables and moderating variables, such as employees' personality traits and organisational culture, to construct a more complete theoretical model. Fourth, longitudinal studies can be conducted to track the changes in leadership styles and work performance of the same group of employees in different times to better reveal the causal relationship and dynamic change process between variables.

Conclusion

The study concludes that leadership styles exert varying effects on work performance. Specifically, autocratic leadership negatively impacts performance, democratic leadership enhances it, and laissez-faire leadership shows no significant influence. The mediating effects of organisational commitment vary across different leadership styles. Specifically, organisational commitment partially mediates the relationship between autocratic leadership and task performance, while it fully mediates the link between autocratic leadership and contextual performance. This indicates that organisational commitment partially influences how autocratic leadership affects the overall work performance of the new generation of employees. Similarly, organisational commitment also partially mediates the relationship between democratic

leadership and both task and contextual performance, suggesting that it plays a partial role in shaping the impact of democratic leadership on employee work performance. However, organisational commitment does not exhibit any mediating effects between laissez-faire leadership and work performance.

Practical Implications

This research not only enriches the theoretical exploration of the link between leadership styles and work performance but also delves into the mediating effect of organisational climate within this connection. Specifically, it presents a fresh perspective and theoretical groundwork for comprehending how leadership styles impact employees' work performance. Furthermore, the study on the associations between distinct leadership styles, including autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire, and multiple aspects of work performance, like task performance and contextual performance, refines and extends the theoretical knowledge in relevant areas. As a result, enterprise managers should be cognisant of the substantial influence that leadership styles exert on both employees' work performance and organisational climate.

Enterprise managers should recognise that leadership styles greatly impact both employees' work performance and the organisational climate. This awareness can help them make better decisions for optimising individual and collective results within the organisation. They should try to avoid adopting the autocratic leadership style and instead adopt the democratic leadership style more often to create a positive organisational climate and improve employees' work performance. In addition, enterprises can help managers improve their leadership abilities and optimise their leadership styles through training and guidance, thus promoting the development of enterprises and the growth of employees. Meanwhile, although this research has not found significant impacts of the laissez-faire leadership style, enterprises still need to pay attention to the potential problems that this leadership style may bring, such as employees' lack of a sense of direction and cohesion and make appropriate adjustments and management according to the actual situation.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Acknowledgment

The authors are thankful to the institutional authority for completion of the work.

References

- Aldabbas, H., & Blaique, L. (2025). How can caring human resource management practices affect employee engagement?. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-09-2023-0500>
- Al Maqbali, R., & Khudari, M. (2024). Leadership styles' effect on Oman food companies: mediating and moderating factors in performance. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 8(6), 6709-6716. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i6.3445>
- Alghizzawi, M., Ahmed, E., Alhawamdeh, Z. M., & Almhaisen, F. (2024). A key factor in leadership style with employee performance: A comparative analysis. In *The AI Revolution: Driving Business Innovation and Research*: 2, 873-883. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54383-8_66
- Amjad, F., Abbas, W., Zia-Ur-Rehman, M., Baig, S. A., Hashim, M., Khan, A., & Rehman, H. U. (2021). Effect of green human resource management practices on organisational sustainability: the mediating role of environmental and employee performance. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28, 28191-28206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-11307-9>
- Antonakis, J. (2003). Why "emotional intelligence" does not predict leadership effectiveness: A comment on Prati, Douglas, Ferris, Ammeter, and Buckley (2003). *The International Journal of Organisational Analysis*, 11(4), 355-361. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb028980>
- Banhos, A. A. (2024). Análise Do Clima Organizacional: Estudo Em Pequenas E Médias Empresas No Polo Empresarial Do Civit-Serra/Es [Analysis of the Organisational Climate: Study in Small and Medium-sized

Companies in the Civit–Serra/ES Business Hub]. *Revista Foco*, 17(7). <https://doi.org/10.54751/revistafoco.v17n7-032>

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. Simon and Schuster. Canada.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in social exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1964.tb00583.x>

Dipboye, R. L. (2018). Leader emergence and effectiveness in Organisations. *The Emerald Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 441-493. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78743-785-220181012>

Fulton, T. L. (2005). Organisational Sensemaking as a Theoretical Framework for the study of Library Leadership. In *Advances in Library Administration and Organisation* (pp. 113-156). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0732-0671\(05\)22004-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0732-0671(05)22004-7)

Ghraiiri, A. M. (2024). Impact of leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour: The mediating role of management control systems. *Corporate Ownership & Control*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv21i1art12>

Hermanto, Y. B., Srimulyani, V. A., & Pitoyo, D. J. (2024). The mediating role of quality of work life and organisational commitment in the link between transformational leadership and organisational citizenship Behaviour. *Heliyon*, 10(6). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27664>

Jha, I. N., Pal, D., & Sarkar, S. (2024). Thriving in diversity: the role of inclusive leadership and workplace inclusion in enhancing satisfaction with life among Indian IT employees. *Journal of Management Development*, 43(5), 663-689. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2023-0269>

Jia, R., Hu, W., & Li, S. (2022). Ambidextrous leadership and organisational innovation: The importance of knowledge search and strategic flexibility. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(3), 781-801. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-07-2020-0544>

Karam, E. P., Gardner, W. L., Gullifor, D. P., Tribble, L. L., & Li, M. (2017). Authentic leadership and high-performance human resource practices: implications for work engagement. In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 35, 103-153. Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-730120170000035004>

Khan, M. U., Muhammad, A., Feroz, F., Jalil, S., Fatima, H., Dawood, J., & Younus, S. A. (2024). Impact of Leadership Styles on Physical Therapy Clinic Performance: The Mediating Role of Employee Engagement and the Moderating Effect of Organisational Culture. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, 13(2), 1012-1017. <https://doi.org/10.61506/01.00428>

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive Behaviour in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 269-299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366>

Malla, S. S., & Malla, S. (2023). Does the perception of Organisational justice determine employees' affective commitment? The mediating role of Organisational trust. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 30(2), 603-627. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-07-2021-0408>

Marzec, I. (2023). The role of LMX and organisational climate in improving performance and effectiveness of local public administration: evidence from the Metropolis GZM. *Rozwój Regionalny i Polityka Regionalna*, (63), 149-163. <https://doi.org/10.14746/rpr.2023.63.09>

McNulty, E. J., Dorn, B. C., Goralnick, E., Serino, R., Grimes, J. O., Flynn, L. B., ... & Marcus, L. J. (2018). Swarm intelligence: establishing Behavioural norms for the emergence of collective leadership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 17(2), 19-41. <https://doi.org/10.12806/V17/I2/R2>

Owotemu, A. E., Bernardi, R., & Nwosu, C. (2024). Impact of Leadership Approaches on Organisational Management & Economic Growth. *Open Access Library Journal*, 11(12), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1112548>

Paek, S. Y., & Lee, J. (2025). Promoting employees' information security vigilance by enhancing awareness: the roles of organisational climate and deterrence measures. *Security Journal*, 38(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41284-024-00460-2>

Rachmat, A., Indratjahyo, H., & Subagja, I. K. (2023). The influence of transformational leadership and organisational commitment on employee performance through communication at the directorate general of budget,

- director general of budget. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 4(3), 942-952. <https://doi.org/10.54660/ijmrge.2023.4.3.942-952>
- Saeed, S., Hassan, I., Dastgeer, G., & Iqbal, T. (2023). The route to well-being at workplace: examining the role of job insecurity and its antecedents. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 32(1), 47-72. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-02-2020-0025>
- Smith, A. M., Duncan, P., Edgar, D., & McColl, J. (2021). Responsible and sustainable farm business: contextual duality as the moderating influence on entrepreneurial orientation. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 22(2), 88-99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465750320944702>
- Wang, W., Kang, S. W., & Choi, S. B. (2021). Effects of employee well-being and self-efficacy on the relationship between coaching leadership and knowledge sharing intention: A study of UK and US employees. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(20). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182010638>
- White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. *Psychological review*, 66(5), 297-333. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0040934>
- Xiu, L., Lv, F., & van Dierendonck, D. (2024). The interplay of servant leadership behaviours and Machiavellianism on perceived leader effectiveness: the role of team conflict management. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 33(3), 289-305. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-09-2022-0281>
- Zahari, M., Akbar, A., & Situmorang, L. T. (2024). The Influence of Democratic Leadership Style and Career Development on Employee Performance Mediated by Jambi Province Regional Secretariat Organisation Bureau Employee Job Satisfaction. *Dinasti International Journal of Education Management and Social Science*, 5(3), 265-277. <https://doi.org/10.31933/dijemss.v5i3.2384>
- Zhang, G., Zhang, X., & Wang, Y. (2024). Perceived insider status and employees' innovative behaviour: the role of knowledge sharing and organisational innovation climate. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 27(2), 589-607. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-03-2022-0123>