

# The Influence of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Effectiveness through Employees' Innovative Behaviour

Hamed Tahsildari, Mohd Taib Hashim, Wan Normeza Wan  
Universiti Teknologi of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur

[hamed\\_tahsildary@yahoo.com](mailto:hamed_tahsildary@yahoo.com), [drmtaibh@ic.utm.my](mailto:drmtaibh@ic.utm.my), [normeza@ic.utm.my](mailto:normeza@ic.utm.my),

## Abstract

The objective of this paper is to concentrate on the influence of transformational leadership on organizational effectiveness by the mediating variable namely employee's innovative behavior. The mediating variable of this study incorporates of four factors namely realizing the problem, creating ideas, proving support for the created ideas, and implementation of the ideas. This paper is about to review the prior studies in connection with the relationship among transformational leadership, organizational effectiveness, and employees' innovative behavior. Organizations are willing to improve their efficiency with the help of appropriate leadership. This study comes up with a conceptual framework for the significance of effective factors to increase the efficiency of organizations.

**Keywords:** transformational leadership, employees' innovative behaviour, organizational performance

## 1. Introduction

According to Ohman (2000) the meaning of transformational leadership is the capability to impact people toward achieving the objectives by shifting the beliefs, values, and needs of the subordinates. A transformational leader makes a goal of what could be finished by the association and can engage others with that goal. This leader finishes that dream while at the same time staying up to date with progressions in the contending environment and cooperating with people inside and outside the association. Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) expressed that utilizing values, for example honour, and equity could shift the traits, convictions, and objectives of workers, persuading them to acknowledge and perform troublesome objectives that they may not ordinarily seek after. Transformational leaders develop the certainty of subordinates and create their capabilities, and empower followers to accept more troublesome tasks (Bass and Avolio, 1990b).

There are three approaches that have been most normally utilized within the investigation of organizational effectiveness namely the goal approach, the systems resource approach, and the process approach. A fresher approach has also emerged called the multiple constituency approach, which is a mixture of the initial three. In the model of goal approach, the effectiveness of an association "is measured as stated by the capability of the association to attain desired objectives. In the systems approach to organizational effectiveness, which drew on the general frameworks hypothesis, effectiveness "is evaluated regarding the association's capability to secure rare resources. The process approach points out to the inside procedures and general working inside an association; for example, the work environment and worker fulfillment. A suitable elective to the objective, frameworks, and process approaches for examining and measuring organizational effectiveness is the multiple constituencies (MC) approach. This model is accepted to have been advanced in an exertion to endeavor to improve the shortcomings of the objective, methodology, and framework displays by joining the two viewpoints. Inventive behaviour is a vital element in the powerful working and progressing survival of associations (Janssen, 2000). Inventive behaviour has been characterized as a singular's conduct that plans to accomplish the purposeful era, advancement, and acknowledgment of new and valuable thoughts, courses of action, items, or systems inside a work part, gathering, or association (Scott and Bruce, 1994). Inventive behaviour is sort of like creativity (i.e., the creation of novel and helpful thoughts concerning items, administrations, methods, and techniques (Amabile, 1996). Nonetheless, Inventive behaviour is plainly not the same as creativity, since this includes the usage of a thought (De Jong and Sanctum Hartog, 2010).

As stated by Pieterse et al. (2010), creativity is a pivotal component of innovative behaviour, most clear at the outset of the improvement process when issues are distinguished and plans are produced because of a need for development (De Jong and Sanctum Hartog, 2010). Subsequently, innovative behaviour incorporates both the creating and implementing of plans.

Few studies have been done regarding the relationship of transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness through the mediating role of employee innovative behaviour. Hence, our major contribution is to focus on the relationship of transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness by the mediating role of employees' innovative behaviour. Accordingly, employees' innovative behaviour incorporates of four factors namely realizing the problem, creating ideas, proving support for the created ideas, and implementation of the ideas.

## 2.Literature Review

### 2.1 Transformational Leadership

As stated by Weese and Windsor (1996) a transformational leader is implied to elevate the desires and the commitments of subordinates by appealing to their higher order psychological needs of feeling valued and part of an energizing and beneficial experience. Hater and Bass (1988) demonstrated that transformational leadership is to a great extent answerable for implementation beyond desires in the U.S. military and also in corporate settings. They additionally expressed "its motivational potential surpasses that of leadership models described by leader-subordinate exchanges transactions—accommodating the needs of subordinates if their execution satisfies desires". The workers of a transformational leader are propelled to accomplish more than what is initially demanded of them. As Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) expressed "transformational leadership is dependent more than the compliance of subordinates; it includes changes in the convictions, the needs, and the qualities of subordinates".

As stated by Bass (1995) "transformational leaders change subordinates to disciples; they create subordinates into pioneers". The concerns of subordinates are raised to those of accomplishment and acknowledgment toward self-actualization instead of requirements for security and security. A transactional leader assists workers to experience out of their particular self-interests and has the capacity to move them to work for the benefit of the association. Bass discovered in his exploration that transformational leaders could persuade followers to create more amazing innovativeness, profit, and surpassing desires. The transformational leaders "gives subordinates a reason around which they can rally" (Bass, 1995).

Bass and Avolio: Segments of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Bass and Avolio (1990b) showed that transactional leadership has a tendency to be less averse for the norm to complete objectives. They laid out three segments of transactional leadership: conditional prizes, active management by exception, and passive management by exemption. Conditional prizes are given in return for craved tasks or conclusions. Despite the fact that this part has been indicated to be compelling if the prizes are certain, Bass and Avolio (1990b) contended, "When the conditional support utilized is negative, the accomplishment of the transactional leader falls". Inactive management by expectations, work execution is checked and remedied as required by the leader. In passive management by exception, the issue is managed after an issue really happens (Dunham-Taylor, 2000).

Bass and Avolio (1990a) depicted a transformational leader as somebody who can "raise the cravings of subordinates for accomplishment and personal development, while likewise improving of associations". There were five essential parts showed by transformational leadership. Bass and Avolio (1995) presented the attributes connected with transformational leadership: individualized consideration, idealized influence (charisma- attributed), idealized influence (behaviour), inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation.

Individualized attention includes a leader giving careful consideration to the needs for accomplishment and development of every person by going about as a guide. By utilizing this trademark, leaders create every representative to progressively more elevated amounts of potential inside the association. The leader is a great person to listen and tailor his or her conduct to help and acknowledge the distinctive contrasts of every worker. Workers are given learning chances inside a supportive work place. The leaders create a purpose of making appearances in the work territory and giving customized regard for workers, empowering two-way relationship. The leaders keep followers mindful of what is going ahead in the association (Bass and Avolio, 1990a; Ohman, 2000).

Admired impact includes leaders going about as good examples for followers. The leaders have a dream and a solid feeling of mission that he or she imparts to followers. He or she demonstrates practices that show an elevated requirement of good and moral behaviour. The leaders make a point to impart dangers to workers, causing followers to relate to them and attempt to copy them (Bass and Avolio, 1990a, 1994, 1995).

### 2.2 Organizational Effectiveness

#### 2.2.1 Goal Approach

In this model, the effectiveness of an association "is measured as stated by the capability of the association to attain desired objectives" (Frisby, 1986). Tagging criteria is expert by uncovering the objectives of the 226

association. These are the operative objectives of those people who settle on the greater part of the choices and can impact the activities of the association instead of the authority objective articulations made by associations. This methodology is accepted to take out the subjective inclination of scientists by concentrating on the destinations or objectives of the association (Frisby, 1986).

Kerr (1991) demonstrated that this methodology characterizes a powerful association "as one that accomplishes its objectives". Case in point, a game association might be compelling if globally positioned groups were handled and if mass support in that specific game were expanded. Ghorpade (1970) claimed that utilizing objectives as a method for measuring organizational effectiveness had a few preferences. For one thing, it concentrates on the objective purposive parts of an association. An alternate point is that this methodology is oversimplified, using a rundown of objectives taken from promptly accessible contracts and formal records (Ghorpade, 1970).

Chor-fait (1996) showed that this model has been broadly condemned by social researchers in spite of its popularity, because objectives are regularly indistinct. Likewise, there are regularly differences around people with respect to the objectives of the association, and about whether, numerous organizational objectives may change. Price (1972) expressed that one issue with this methodology is that the objectives of an association are frequently not formally characterized, which is pivotal to deciding effectiveness. An alternate issue includes the absence of appropriate objective distinguishing. It is troublesome to focus objective accomplishment if the objectives are not ready to be recognized. Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) scrutinized the objective methodology for two reasons: Initially, objectives as perfect states don't offer the likelihood of sensible appraisal; second, objectives as social substances emerge outside of the association as a social framework and can't discretionarily be ascribed as properties of the association itself.

### 2.2.2 Systems Approach

As stated by Frisby (1986), in the systems approach to organizational effectiveness, which drew on the general systems theory, effectiveness "is measured in terms of the organization's ability to acquire scarce resources". Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) saw it as a conceptualization of the relationship between an association and nature's domain, which goes about as "the key source of data concerning organizational effectiveness ". Kerr (1991) expressed that a game association might be successful as stated by this methodology in the event that "it procured rare financing from government sources and if it pulled in exceedingly qualified mentors and chairmen".

In the systems approach, the distinctiveness of the association as an identifiable social element is underscored. In this approach the interdependence between the association and its surroundings is as an information yield transaction and "the object of these transactions falls into the classification of rare and esteemed resourced" (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967). The association obtain the requirement from nature's domain and consolidates them in a productive and profitable way, which encourages the accomplishment of objectives. Thus, it makes it simpler to secure future assets. The quality of these assets is not determined from their connection to a particular objective, but instead identified with their utility as a method for hierarchical action. These assets are additionally for the most part the center of rivalry between associations. (Connolly et al., 1980) expressed in their survey of the previous literature that Parsons (1960) gave four fundamental issues that show how powerful an association is by how well they are tackled: objective accomplishment, adjustment, integration, and pattern maintenance.

### 2.2.3 Process Approach

The process approach refers to the internal processes and general functioning within an organization such as the work environment and employee satisfaction. These processes enable the conversion of inputs to outputs. The organization would be considered effective if the internal processes are smooth, efficient, and goal directed (Soucie, 1994).

Chelladurai and Haggerty (1991) recognized three variables identified with the process approach. These were association, choice making, staff relations, and boundary spanning. Association or organization includes work, obligations, and regulatory structure. Choice making or decision making alludes to "the degree to which choices are made at those levels where the essential data dwells, influenced people are counselled, and data is imparted by parts". Personal relations concerns worker welfare, satisfaction, and working conditions. It additionally includes the positive connections between workers and employers.

### 2.2.4 Multiple-Constituency Approach

As stated by the previous studies, a suitable elective to the objective, frameworks, and process approaches for examining and measuring organizational effectiveness is the Multiple Constituencies (MC) approach. This model is accepted to have been advanced in an exertion to endeavor to improve the shortcomings of the objective, methodology, and framework displays by joining the two viewpoints (Chor-fait, 1996). Subunits inside an association might likewise be seen as micro-associations that are included in the genuine outline and conveyance of items or administrations. These micro-associations must adjust to nature, which may be considered as a system of constituencies, for survival.

These constituencies may rely on upon a subunit for assets, or may control the assets the subunit needs, or even contend with a subunit for rare assets. In this manner, a constituency "alludes to a gathering of people holding comparable inclination or diversions relating to the exercises of a central association unit" (Tsui, 1990). A few cases of constituencies incorporate holders, administrators, workers, clients, and purchaser advocates. Tsui expressed that these could be determined from an "investigation of the association's business, the business in which it works, its preparation engineering, and its outside work and lawful situations" (Tsui, 1990).

Since people participate associations for a mixture of reasons, "these reasons will be reflected in an assortment of diverse assessments" it is considered self-assertive to name one as the stand out that is appropriate (Connolly et al., 1980). Zammuto (1984) expressed that "a general judgment of organizational effectiveness is seen as being not possible or alluring because the methodology does not make any suppositions concerning the relative primacy of one constituency's judgments over those of any other constituency", therefore the MC methodology might be viewed as a more proper approach to measure organizational effectiveness. Tsui (1990) demonstrated that the MC approach has two fundamental parts. One part is distinct which frameworks how things function, while alternate is standardizing, showing how things should function (Tsui, 1990)

Zammuto (1984) gave four separate models identified with this approach, each one presenting an alternate elucidation concerning organizational effectiveness. The primary was the relativistic model which sees the MC approach as a method for experimentally gathering data about an organizational performance from distinctive organizational constituencies with the goal that adequacy is not seen as one explanation about an organizational effectiveness. Every constituency has inclination for execution that is dependent upon the way of that specific constituency with the association itself. "The judgments of effectiveness are inexorably dependent upon which people or associations supply the criteria for assessment" (Keeley, 1984).

In his argument of the force point of view Zammuto (1984) demonstrated Pennings and Goodman's (1977) predominant coalition demonstrate in which the parts of the association "arrange the criteria against which an association's performance is judged". The parts that have the best power might be less averse to have more stupendous impact on the conclusion of the transaction process and to have the capacity to force their execution points of view on different parts. As stated by this model, if the requests of the most capable parts are fulfilled, then the association is powerful because it guarantees the proceeded backing of those parts and the survival of the association. As stated by Keeley (1984), to evaluate organizational effectiveness:

One must, in the first place, recognize pertinent members, acknowledging what assets are discriminating to the association and who could potentially give them; second, weigh the relative force of members to control basic assets; third, focus the criteria by which different members assess the association; and, at last, evaluate the effect of organizational movements on these weighted criteria.

The evolutionary sees estimation of organizational performance as a collection of procedure in which "constituent inclination are dealt with as being inadequate for surveying the adequacy of organizational effectiveness since they don't reflect the potential limitation of execution" (Zammuto, 1984). These potential limitations characterize an the niche of an association in connection to different associations. This model likewise acknowledges time as a component impacting an association's measure of effectiveness due to the changes that may happen about whether in regards to constituents, their inclination, and the potential impediments.

This implies that what may be seen as effective performance at one time may be seen as ineffectual at an alternate time. This model measures the effectiveness of an association dependent upon how it can perform as time goes on in a societal setting and how adaptable the association is given the components of inclination, obligations, and time (Zammuto, 1984). Thus, organisational effectiveness is considered in this study as a multi process, with different activities.

**2.3 A Multi-Stage Process of Innovative Behaviour** Innovative behaviour is a multi-stage procedure of issue distinguishment, idea creating, providing support for 228

idea, and idea implementing (Janssen, 2000; Pieterse et al., 2010; Scott and Bruce, 1994). The extent of innovative behaviour ranges from thought idea making to usage of new plans that have an effect on items and methods over the whole association (Janssen, 2003). Likewise, Dorenbosch et al., (2005) exactly recommended innovative behaviour including a multi-stage methodology, for example, idea generating and idea implementing. Employee innovative behaviour starts with distinguishing issues, which are frequently stimulators for the generating of novel and helpful thoughts (Drucker, 1985). In this stage, workers investigate new business open doors and distinguish issues or execution holes in existing items and administrations (de Jong and Nook Hartog, 2010).

Besides, issue distinguishment prompts thought idea generating, which is the processing of plans in any area. Since thought idea generating includes exercises of transforming novel and valuable plans (Woodman et al., 1993), this stage might be additionally seen as workers creativity in essence (Pieterse et al., 2010). The third procedure of the innovative behaviour comprises of providing support for plans (Janssen, 2000). That is, once people have produced a thought, they need to take part in social exercises to discover associates, moguls, and stakeholders encompassing a thought, or to assemble a coalition of supporters (i.e., Presidents), who possibly give the important power behind it (Janssen, 2000).

The last procedure of the innovative behaviour includes thought usage by transforming a methodology, model, or model of the improvement that could be inevitably connected inside a singular work handle, a gathering, or a whole association (Janssen, 2000). Subsequently, innovative behaviour is seen in this exposition as a multistage process, with distinctive exercises and diverse distinct practices needed at each one stage.

### **3. Conceptual Framework**

#### **3.1 Transformational Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness**

In spite of the fact that few studies have been directed to research the relationship between organizational effectiveness and transformational leadership, there has been almost no accord on whether leadership has a positive impact on adequacy. Pratt and Eitzen (1989), case in point demonstrated that an association's effectiveness might be the aftereffect of "leadership style, the moral of followers, the execution level, the development of the members, the sort of product or administration, whether the tasks need interaction or independent movement or some other variable". They argued that "despite the fact that there are numerous variables that influence organizational effectiveness, the role of leader is crucial". Additionally, Rieley (1993) expressed that organizational effectiveness requires an environment made through successful leadership that energizes the achievement.

Rieley (1993) demonstrated in his study that a leader has to show certain qualities to help the effectiveness of the association. One of the transformational aspects he discovered to be significant for this was the communicating of a plan of the association's future. This assists to create an authority environment that sets the tone for the whole organization. This kind of behaviour provides the association something to strive for.

Branch (1990) found that the transformational trademark feature initiating construct was a huge benefactor to hierarchical effectiveness around physical directors. However, attention was not discovered to be a huge contributing fact. The researcher demonstrated that this discovering was unforeseen in view of the large acknowledged thought that despite the fact that an orientation to undertaking and objective achievement is essential in progressing in the direction of achievement, an advancement of the human component is additionally seen as an imperative supporter to the accomplishment of an association.

Wang and Satow (1994) interfaced distinctive administration capacities to diverse viewpoints identified with organizational effectiveness. Generally, hierarchical effectiveness had a nearby association with the leadership capacities of informative styles, hope, and feeling, which are nearly identified with the participative aspects of transformational leadership. The informativeness capacities of leadership were discovered to have a solid connection with organizational effectiveness segments market share, competitiveness, and occupation fulfillment.

#### **3.2 Transformational Leadership and Innovative Behavior**

The hypothetical connection with innovative behaviour has been a significant topic in calculated and experimental examines of transformational leadership (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bass and Riggio, 2006; Eisenbeiss et al., since few specialists accept that transformational leadership advertises worker innovative behaviour (Boerner et al., 2007; Conger and Kanungo, 1987; Eisenbeiss and Boerner, 2010; Lee, 2007; Michaelis et al., 2010). These group inspirations and practices are relied upon to make more open doors to produce workers' inventive behaviour. Subsequently, transformational leadership is best in propelling employees with the goal that 229

they plan enhanced frameworks, execute them, and redirect their workers' exercises in like manner (Kanter, 2004).

In previous studies, transformational leadership appears to be the most basic element influencing innovative behaviour (Lee, 2007; Pieterse et al., 2010), in light of the fact that the leaders assume an essential part in producing innovative plans and executing innovation (Tushman and Nadler, 1986). Locke and Baum (2007) contended that leaders may be pulled in to high-doubt circumstances and are more tolerant of questionable

matter. These aspects of leadership inspire both the leaders and their subordinates to carry on all the more inventively dependent upon the beliefs that their deliberations will prompt innovative conclusions that they want.

As stated by García-Morales et al. (2008a), the innovative behaviour of subordinates includes looking for new open doors or answers for issues, producing diverse methods for considering, and actualizing exploratory points of view. All the more particularly, sub dimensions of transformational leadership may decidedly influence innovative behaviour of employees.

In the first place, transformational leaders have an unconventional and forcing vision and serve as an alluring good example for being innovative (Eisenbeiss and Boerner, 2010). Correspondingly, Conger and Kanungo (1987) affirmed that the transformational leader generally takes part in innovative behaviours that regularly are counter to accepted standards (Keller, 1992). Therefore, transformational leaders upgrade personal identification of employees and produce solid enthusiastic connection. Subordinates may change their self-identities and, in this way, innovative behaviour (Eisenbeiss and Boerner, 2010; Kark et al., 2003).

Second, by giving motivational inspiration, transformational leaders energize their subordinates to recognize issues inside present business procedures and products and to look for new open doors to advance well beyond rivals (Bass, 1999; Bass and Avolio, 2000; García-Morales et al., 2008a). Inspirational motivation is particularly compelling in the thought era process (Sosik et al., 1998) since transformational leaders urge subordinates to propose any intriguing thought without the apprehension of being rebuffed (Amabile et al., 1996). Consequently, followers under transformational leadership have a tendency to feel sheltered about producing novel and helpful thoughts, which are now and again acknowledged to be garbage by other individuals, and in this way display innovative behaviour.

Third, transformational leaders, by utilizing intellectual stimulation, energize employees to attempt diverse methods for considering, propose creative answers for issues, and effectively execute creative manners of thinking (García-Morales et al., 2008a). Intellectual stimulation includes empowering the behaviour of subordinates to be innovative by addressing assumptions, reframing issues, and approaching old circumstances in new ways (Jansen et al., 2008). Additionally, transformational leaders energize followers to think 'out of the case' and receive an explorative thinking style (Jung et al., 2003). Besides, transformational leaders keep on challenging workers to unravel the current issues inside working courses of action and effectively execute better answers for innovation. In this way, transformational leaders animate followers to basically assess existing working procedures and redesign current products (Bass, 1985; Eisenbeiss and Boerner, 2010).

Fourth, transformational leaders think about individual requirement and give customized training by giving singular attention (Rank et al., 2009). Transformational leaders likewise indicate compassion and support for followers, which ought to help beat their alarm of testing business as usual, prompting more inventive behaviour (Gong et al., 2009).

### 3.3 Innovative Behavior and Organizational Effectiveness

Extensive changes in today's business environment have caused organizations and managers to show more sensitivity concerning their efficiency which results in increasing consideration towards employees' behaviour. In this respect, organizations need people who go beyond their defined career duties, tend to develop cooperation, and help colleagues employers and clients (Gholipour and Sadat, 2008); such behaviours are termed organizational citizenship behaviours (Zareieman et al., 2010). Organizations cannot continue to increase their efficiency without having employee's good behaviour (Jahangir and Hag, 2004).

A firm's capability to produce innovations has been suggested to be crucial for its success. Being innovative is an important determinant of an organization's efficiency (Hult et al., 2004). Thus, organizational efficiency can be improved through technical and administrative innovation besides other factors (Llorens Montes et al., 2005). Previous research has studied the effects of innovations and innovativeness on organizational performance (Bowen et al. 2010; Gunday et al., 2011). Innovating firms have been found to have higher levels of productivity and economic growth than non-innovating firms (Cainelli et al., 2004). Not only technical innovations but also organizational innovations which 230

also include innovative behaviour among employees are essential conditions for improving efficiency and for increasing the firm's value (Bowen et al. 2010). In addition, a firm's overall efficiency and being innovative are strictly and positively related to each other (Mazzanti et al., 2006).

Former exploration illuminates us that an imparted concentrate on innovation around people identifies with significant business results (Cakar and Erturk 2010). Innovative behaviour of employees refers to a key aspect of organizational effectiveness: the creation, introduction and application of new ideas within a group or organization in order to benefit performance (Sanders et al., 2010).

### 3.4 Related Theories

#### 3.4.1 Leadership within Organizational Contexts

Bass (1985) developed a theory of leadership within organizational contexts (Howell and Higgins, 1990). According to Bass (1985), transformational leaders articulate and present a clear vision, demonstrate enthusiasm and passion for the vision, and inspire and motivate employees to work hard to obtain that vision. In summary, transformational leadership requires a leader to inspire others and create a collective vision (Burns, 1978). The independent variable of this study is transformational leadership. Transformational leaders inspire and motivate followers to perform at exceptional levels (Bass, 1985).

#### 3.4.2 Trait theory and behavioral theory

Since transformational leadership includes charisma (a personality trait) and motivational process (a behavior), it is reasonable to assert that transformational leadership embraces both the trait theory and behavioral theory of leadership (Judge and Bono, 2000).

#### 3.4.3 Expectancy Theory

Based on the literature review, transformational leadership seems to be the most critical factor affecting innovative behavior (e.g., Lee, 2007; Pieterse et al., 2010), because the leaders play an important role in generating innovative ideas and implementing innovation (Tushman and Nadler, 1986). Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory provides a fundamental theoretical basis for understanding how transformational leaders affect followers' innovative behavior. Vroom (1964) suggested that people make rational decisions about exerting effort based on the perceptions that their effort will generate outcomes that they value. Therefore, this study attempts to investigate the effect of transformational leadership on employee's innovative behaviour.

#### 3.4.4 Economic Development

Innovation is defined as "the degree to which new and useful ideas (products, services, processes, and concepts) are developed with time and budget constraints" (Gebert et al., 2010). This construct has received widespread attention from both the business world and academia, because it has been considered as one of the most important determinants of organizational efficiency and ongoing survival (Crossan and Apaydin, 2010). In his writings about the theory of economic development, Schumpeter (1934) first suggested the definition of innovation within the domain of the firm, emphasizing the novelty aspect (Hansen and Wakonen, 1997). According to Schumpeter (1934), innovation is reflected in novel outputs: a new product; a new process of production; or a new organizational structure, which can be summarized as doing things differently. This study also investigates the effect of innovative behaviour on the organizational effectiveness because based on the theory of the economic development, innovation influences on the output and efficiency of the organizations.

## Conceptual Framework

This study presents that transformational leadership is going to lead to organizational effectiveness stronger by the mediating role of employees' innovative behaviour. Accordingly, the above conceptual frame work

provides a big comprehension about the relationship among the variables of the study.

### 3. Discussion

Innovative behaviour is a generally discretionary behaviour and is not formally distinguished by most present authoritative prize frameworks (Ramamoorthy et al., 2005). Nevertheless, workers participating in such practices may help their gatherings and associations viably accomplish imaginative destinations (Ramamoorthy et al., 2005). In this respect, innovative behaviour has some closeness to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) (Jafri, 2010). The principle distinction is that innovative behaviour serves as a critical thinking methodology utilized by workers to adapt to strengthened assignment necessities or to break down present hierarchical schedules (Janssen, 2000), while OCB simply concerns helping others and moving beyond the typical desires in the occupation (Robbins and Judge, 2009). Thusly, innovative behaviour may help workers enhance their fit with higher work prerequisites by making, advertising, and executing thoughts (Janssen, 2000). In the following segment, a multi-stage process of innovative behaviour will be explained.

Generally, transformational leadership accentuates group engages and affects followers to relinquish their eagerness toward oneself for the purpose of the authoritative objective (Bass et al., 2003). Accordingly, employees impart the significance of group participation and are additionally eager to create innovative plans and partake in the innovation actualizing procedure (Bass and Riggio, 2006). These powerful techniques prompt stronger inspiration to show innovative behaviour around followers by creating associations of committed employees (García-Morales et al., 2008a; Tushman and Nadler, 1986).

A great deal of exploration has been carried out in the most recent two decades, and strategic human resource management specialists have focalized in their conviction that HRM is connected with hierarchical results, the understanding of the "HRM-execution " relationship, including innovative behaviour is still open to address. It is asserted that innovative behaviour of workers characterized as the creation, presentation and requisition of new thoughts inside an association keeping in mind the end goal to profit execution (Janssen, 2000) is significant for the long-lasting survival of associations (Van de Ven, 1986) .

### 4. Conclusion

Research has demonstrated that transformational leadership is related to organizational effectiveness. Organizations make effort to seek for suitable type of leadership which can increase the effectiveness of their associations. Leaders in transformational leadership motivate subordinate to make efforts for supreme objectives rather than payoffs. According to Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) transformational leadership is not about an exchange of commodities between followers and leaders, it originates in the personal values and beliefs of leaders. Generally, according to Bass (1997) in all nations, the appropriate type of leadership is transformational. In connection with increasing the effectiveness of the organizations,

Transformational leadership are the most critical factor affecting innovative behavior (Lee, 2007; Pieterse et al., 2010), because the leaders play an important role in generating innovative ideas and implementing innovation (Tushman and Nadler, 1986). Employees' innovative behavior consists of four factors namely realizing the problem, creating ideas, proving support for the created ideas, and implementation of the deas. 232

Transformational leadership helps organizations to be more effective in terms of achieving their goals. Therefore, transformational leaders enhance both the efficiency of the individuals and organizations. Future research could be an investigation of the variables that are defined by the relevant theory for the relationship of transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness. Furthermore, further research could focus on organizational innovation as the dependent variable.

#### REFERENCES:

- Amabile, T. M. (1996). *Creativity in context*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., and Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154-1184.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1995). Theory of transformational leadership redux. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 463-478.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1990a). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 4, 21-37.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1990b). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4, 231- 272.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Binghamton: Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. and Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership.
- Bass, B. M., and Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Boerner, S., Eisenbeiss, S. A., Griesser, D. (2007). Follower Behaviour and Organizational Performance: The Impact of Transformational Leaders. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(3), 15-26.
- Bowen, F.E., Rostami, M. and Steel, P. (2010), "Timing is everything: a meta-analysis of the relationships between organisational performance and innovation", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 63 No. 11, pp. 1179-1185.
- Branch, D. (1990). Athletic director leader behaviour as a predictor of intercollegiate athletic organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Sport Management*, 4 (2), 161-173.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York : Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Cakar, N. D., and Erturk, A. (2010). Comparing innovation capability of small and medium-sized enterprises: Examining the effects of organizational culture and empowerment. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 48(3), 325-359.
- Cainelli, G., Evangelista, R. and Savona, M. (2004), "The impact of innovation on economic performance in services", *Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 116-130.
- Chelladurai, P., and Haggery, T. R. (1991). Measures of organizational effectiveness of Canadian national sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Sciences*. 16(2), 126-133.
- Chor-fait, A. (1996). Rethinking organizational effectiveness: Theoretical and methodological issues in the study of organizational effectiveness for social welfare organizations. *Administration in Social Work*, 20 (4), 1-21.
- Conger, J. A., and Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioural theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637- 647
- Connolly, T., Conlon, E. J., and Deutsch, S. J. (1980). Organizational effectiveness: A multiple constituency approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 5 (2), 211-217.
- Crossan, M. M., and Apaydin, M. (2010). A Multi-Dimensional Framework of Organizational Innovation: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(6), 1154-1191.
- De Jong, J., and Den Hartog, D. (2010), 'Measuring Innovative Work Behaviour,' *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19, 23-36.
- Dorenbosch, L., van Engen, M., and Verhagen, M. (2005). On-the-Job Innovation: The Impact of Job Design and Human Resource Management through Production Ownership. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14, 129-141.

- Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. London: Heinemann.
- Dunham-Taylor, J. (2000). Nurse executive transformational leadership found in participative organizations. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 30 (5), 241-250.
- Eisenbeiss, S. A., and Boerner, S. (2010). Transformational Leadership and RandD Innovation: Taking a Curvilinear Approach. *Creative and Innovation Management*, 1-9.
- Frisby, W.* (1986). Measuring the organizational effectiveness of national sport governing bodies. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 11(2), 94-99.
- García-Morales, V. J., Llorens-Montes, F. J., and Verdu-Jover, A. J. (2008a). The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Performance through Knowledge and Innovation. *British Journal of Management*, 19, 299-319.
- Gebert, D., Boerner, S., and Kearney, E. (2010). Fostering Team Innovation: Why Is It Important to Combine Opposing Action Strategies? *Organization Science*, 21(3), 593–608.
- Gholipour, A. and Sadat, S.A. (2008), "The relationship of organizational climate and job stress and its impacts on teachers of high schools", *Commercial Strategies*, Vol. 1 No. 8, pp. 55-64.
- Ghorpade, J. (1970). Study of organizational effectiveness: Two prevailing viewpoints. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 13, 31-40.
- Gong, Y., Huang, J.-C., and Farh, J. L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership, and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creative self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 765-778.
- Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G., Kilic, K. and Alpkan, L. (2011), "Effects of innovation types on firm performance", *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 133 No. 2, pp. 662-676.
- Hansen, S. O., and Wakonen, J. (1997). Innovation, a winning solution? *International Journal of Technology Management*, 13, 345-358.
- Hater, J. J., and Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73 (4), 695-702.
- Howell, J. M., and Higgins, C. A. (1990). Champions of change: Identifying, understanding, and supporting champions of technological innovations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 40-55.
- Hult, G.T.M., Hurley, R.F. and Knight, G.A. (2004), "Innovativeness: its antecedents and impact on business performance", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 429-438.
- Jafri, M. H. (2010). Organizational Commitment and Employee's Innovative Behaviour. *Journal of Management Research*, 10(1), 62-68.
- Jahangir, N. and Hag, M. (2004), "Organizational citizenship behaviour: its nature and antecedent", *Brac University Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 75-85.
- Jansen, J. J. P, George, G., Van den Bosch, F. A. J., and Volberda, H. W. (2008). Senior Team Attributes and Organizational Ambidexterity: The Moderating Role of Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(5), 982-1007.
- Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort—reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 287- 302.
- Judge, T. A., and Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 751-765.
- Kanter, R. M. (2004). The middle manager as innovator. *Harvard Business Review*, 82, 150–161.
- Kark, R., Shamir, B., and Chen, G. (2003). The Two Faces of Transformational Leadership: Empowerment and Dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 246-55.
- Keeley, M. (1984). Impartiality and participant interest theories of organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, (1), 1-25.
- Keller, R. T. (1992). Transformational Leadership and the Performance of Research and Development Project Groups. *Journal of Management*, 18(3), 489-501.
- Kerr, G. (1991). Improving organizational effectiveness in sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport* 234

Sciences, 16 (2), 84-85.

Kuhnert, K. W., and Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12 (4), 648-657.

Lee, J. (2007). Effects of leadership and leader-member exchange on innovativeness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(6), 670-687.

Llorens Montes, F.J., Ruiz-Moreno, A. and Garcí'a Morales, V. (2005), "Influence of support leadership and teamwork cohesion on organisational learning, innovation and performance: an empirical examination", *Technovation*, Vol. 25 No. 10, pp. 1159-1172.

Locke, E. A., and Baum, J. R. (2007). Entrepreneurial motivation. In J. R. Baum, M. Frese, and R. A. Baron (Eds.), *The psychology of entrepreneurship* (pp. 93-112). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

azzanti, M., Pini, P. and Tortia, E. (2006), "Organisational innovations, human resources and firm performance: the Emilia-Romagna food sector", *Journal of Socio-Economics*, Vol. 35.No. 1, pp. 123-141

Michaelis, B., Stegmaier, R., and Sonntag, K. (2010). Shedding light on follower's innovation implementation behaviour: The role of transformational leadership, commitment to change, and climate for initiative. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(4), 408-429.

Ohman, K. A. (2000). The transformational leadership of critical care nurse-managers. *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing*, 19 (1), 46-53.

Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and processes in modern societies*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Pennings, J. M., and Goodman, P. S. (1977). Toward a workable framework. P. S. Goodman and J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 146-184.

Pieterse, A. N., van Knippenberg, D., Schippers, M., and Stam, D., (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behaviour: The moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 31(4), 609-623.

Pratt, S. R., and Eitzen, D. S. (1989). Contrasting leadership styles and organizational effectiveness: The case of athletic teams. *Social Science Quarterly*, 70 (2), 311-322.

Price, J. L. (1972). The study of organizational effectiveness. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 13, 3-15.

Ramamoorthy, N., Flood, P. C., Slattery, T., and Sardesai, R. (2005). Determinants of Innovative Work Behaviour: Development and Test of an Integrated Model. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 142- 150.

Rank, J., Nelson, N. E., Allen, T. D., and Xu, X. (2009). Leadership predictors of innovation and task performance: Subordinates' self-esteem and self-presentation as moderators. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 465-489.

Rieley, J. B. (1993). The circular organization: how leadership can optimize organizational effectiveness. *National Productivity Review*, 13 (1), 11-20.

Sanders, K., Moorkamp, M., Torka, N., Groeneveld, S., and Groeneveld, C. (2010). How to Support Innovative Behaviour? The Role of LMX and Satisfaction with HR Practices. *Technology and Investment*, 1(1).

Schumpeter, J. A., (1934). *Theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Scott, S. G., and Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behaviour: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal* 37, 580-607.

Sosik, J.J., Kahai, S.S., and Avolio, B.J. (1998). Transformational Leadership and Dimensions of Creativity: Motivating Idea Generation in Computer-Mediated Groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 11(2), 111-121.

Soucie, D. (1994). Effective managerial leadership in sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 5(1), 1-13.

Tsui, A. S. (1990). A multiple-constituency model of effectiveness: an empirical

Tushman, M. L., and Nadler, D.A. (1986). Organizing for innovation. *California Management Review*, 28(3), 74-92.

Van de Ven. A. (1986). Central problems in the management of innovation. *Management Science*,

- Wang, Z. M., and Satow, T. (1994). Leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in Chinese Japanese joint ventures. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9 (4), 31-36.
- Weese, W. J. (1996). Do leadership and organizational culture really matter? *Journal of Sport Management*, 70(2), 197-206.
- Woodman, Richard W, Sawyer, John E, and Griffin, Ricky W. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity. *Academy of management review*, 293-321.
- Yuchtman, E., and Seashore, S. E. (1967). A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 891-903.
- Zammuto, R. F. (1984). A comparison of multiple constituency models of organizational effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 606-616.
- Zareiematin, H., Alvani, S.M., Jandaghi, G. and Ahmadi, F. (2010), "Introducing a comprehensive model of factors impacting on developing organizational citizenship behaviour; case study: employees of National Oil Industry of Iran", *Public Management*, Vol. 2 No. 5, pp. 39-56.