

Leader-Follower Theory – Analysis of Leadership Style

Ana Udovičić

University of Applied Science Šibenik, Croatia

Frane Urem

University of Applied Science Šibenik, Croatia

Abstract

Leadership has been a field of great interest for researchers and scholars for decades. Still, the second half of the 20th century saw intense interest in understanding and distinguishing leadership, both in academic circles and in practice. Over the years, leadership has been extensively researched across theoretical foundations and contexts. Leadership is generally defined by the traits, qualities, and behaviors of the leader. Leadership research has expanded across decades, different cultures, and theoretical beliefs. In contrast to Trait Theories, Behavioral Leadership Theories, and Situational Leadership Theories, which emphasize the leader's isolated function, Leader-Follower Theory focuses on the complex and significant relationship between the leader and his followers and their interconnected roles. The leader becomes a group leader who can both lead and follow. The purpose of this paper is to present previous research on transactional, transformational, and charismatic leadership, as well as servant and authentic leadership. Furthermore, the paper will provide a critical review of the levels and theoretical determinants of leadership: intra-individual, dyadic, group, and organizational processes.

Keywords: leadership, leadership theories, leader-follower theory

JEL classification: A1

Paper type: Research article

Received: 19 March 2025

Accepted: 9 June 2025

DOI: 10.54820/entrenova-2025-0022

Citation: Udovičić, A., & Urem, F. Leader-Follower Theory – Analysis of Leadership Style. ENTRENOVA - ENTERprise REsearch InNOVation, 11(1), <https://doi.org/10.54820/entrenova-2025-00022>.

Introduction

Leadership has been a field of great interest to researchers and scholars for decades. Still, the second half of the 20th century saw intense interest in understanding and distinguishing leadership, both in scientific circles and in practice. Different authors have offered various definitions of leadership, and it is possible to conclude that there is no generally accepted definition. From a review of the relevant scientific and professional literature, it is possible to observe both similarities and differences in the definitions of leadership and to recognize that definitions change periodically, reflecting the latest research, new theories, and models in the field. Over the years, leadership has been extensively researched in various theoretical foundations and different contexts. The last 20 years of the 20th century have seen the emergence of newer approaches to leadership, such as charismatic and transformational leadership, group leadership, the "leadership" leadership style, and many others. From all of the above, it is possible to conclude that there is no clear, unique profile of an excellent leader, and no generally accepted definition of a successful leader. The reason mentioned above is why leadership remains one of the most researched phenomena today, continues to interest scientists and theorists, and remains the center of their detailed research and study.

The purpose of this paper is to present significant and implemented empirical research on transactional, transformational, and charismatic leadership, as well as servant and authentic leadership. Furthermore, the paper will provide a critical review of the levels and theoretical determinants of leadership: intra-individual, dyadic, group, and organizational processes.

Transformational, Transactional, and Charismatic Leadership

Since its introduction more than 20 years ago, transformational or charismatic leadership has been strongly emphasized in the management literature (Bass, 1985, 1997; Den Hartog et al, 1999; Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001; House, 1996). According to them, transformational leaders articulate a realistic, shareable vision of the future, stimulate their subordinates intellectually, and care about differences among subordinates. Many believe that presenting an ideological vision of a better future, consistent with followers' strong beliefs, is central to this leadership style. Bass (1985) thus believes that individuals form groups to obtain rewards and avoid punishment. They are attracted to larger groups if they expect rewards or support from them. Some members will try to change others' behavior when rewards are at stake or when avoiding punishment is the goal.

Downton first distinguished transformational leadership from transactional leadership to explain the difference between revolutionary, rebellious, reformist, and truly transformational leaders on the one hand, and "ordinary," truly transactional leaders on the other. Downton's setting did not take hold until Burns published a work on political leaders. Burns describes a way for transactional political leaders to motivate their followers through a simple exchange of rewards for favors rendered. Transactional leadership explains the functioning of the leader-follower relationship as a simple $S \rightarrow R$ relationship. The author distinguishes this type of leadership from the type of leadership under whose influence followers are motivated to achieve organizational goals and to activate greater efforts to achieve higher needs according to Maslow, such as self-actualization, and not only for the realization and fulfillment of personal interests (Vrdoljak Raguž, 2009). Bernard Bass, in collaboration with Avolio and Seltzer, developed the model of transactional-transformational

leadership in the period from 1985 to 1994. They determined that transformational leadership implies an everyday exchange between leaders and followers that includes: unexpected rewards, active and passive correction of irregularities and laissez faire. A transformational leader strengthens the interests of his followers, and appears through four dimensions: charisma, inspiration, stimulating the intellect and taking care of the individual. Bass concluded that transactional leadership is most often combined with transformational leadership and that only in this way can a leader achieve business results. (Vrdoljak Raguž, 2009).

A key prerequisite for transformational leadership is transactional leadership. Transactional leadership is actually the opposite of transformational leadership. According to Avolio and Yammarino, transactional leadership "focuses on clarifying the employee's role and task conditions and providing positive and negative praise depending on performance." The aforementioned encompasses the type of leadership that previous theories have focused on, including Fiedler's theory and Path to Goal Theory. (Laguerre, 2010), Bass and Avolio (2005) defined the Full Range Model as a framework for integrating research on transactional and transformational leadership. According to Bass, a leader transforms and motivates followers by fostering an understanding of the importance of task outcomes, involving followers in transcending self-interest for organizational or group interests, and activating higher-level needs. According to Bass (1985), transactional and transformational leadership are different but not mutually exclusive.

During the 1900s, Bass and Avolio developed the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to identify four distinct characteristics of transformational leaders, which they called the "4I's": Ideal influence or charisma, based on followers' reactions and leader behavior. Followers identify with and admire leaders. Leaders are deeply respected, have referent power, and set high standards and challenging goals for their followers. Inspirational motivation: depending on how much followers want to identify with the leader. The leader uses symbols and images to increase awareness of shared or desirable goals. Intellectual stimulation: followers let go of the past and are encouraged to question their own beliefs, values, and expectations, as well as those of the leader and the organization. Individual consideration: different but equal relationships with followers. Leaders delegate tasks to their followers to provide learning opportunities and teach them when needed.

The MLQ questionnaire is the longest-established and most widely used way of measuring transformational and transactional leadership. Several studies (Barling, Weber & Kelloway, 1996; Berson & Avolio, 2004; Kirkbride, 2006; Manheim & Halamish, 2008) examined the validity of the MLQ. Most studies support the distinction between transformational and transactional leadership as a broad category, but in some cases, only after eliminating weak items or the entire scale. Therefore, the mentioned elimination weakens support for differentiation between transformational and transactional leadership. Most cases of MLQ testing included are initial evaluations led by MLQ and rely on the organization to establish training to help leaders act in a transformational style. However, despite the theory still being in the developmental stage of scientific testing and proof, there are several similarities in the implementation of theories.

One of the most significant studies was conducted by Avolio and Berson (2004) whose study provided support for the development of transformational leadership. Avolio and Berson investigated the relationship between the leadership style of executive and middle management in a large Israeli telecommunications organization and their effectiveness in communicating strategic organizational goals. The study included 2,200 employees. All respondents rated their managers on

leadership outcomes and departmental/organizational outcomes (e.g., type of persuasion tactics used and communication style). Leadership style was measured using the MLQ. The results of the study indicated that "leaders who were rated as (more) transformational demonstrated a higher level of articulation of strategic goals and were research-oriented.

James McGregor (1978) in his in the book "Leadership" he was actually the first to state the concept of "transformed" leadership". According to Burns, leadership is "a relationship mutual simulations and evaluations who transforms follower to leader and which can convert leaders in moral agents". Burns goes further in his defining and states that: "(transformed leadership) happens when one or more person they are included with to others on such way for leaders and followers they elevate units others on more levels morality and motivations..." Burns relies on humanistic movements in your work at writing about "transformed" leadership "proposing that transformational leader creates, complements and equalizes motives, values and goals of their own followers through achieving significant changes in that process. He believes that there is certain force determined in transformed leadership with leaders "who are armed with principles that can ultimately case transform at the same time and leaders and a follower in a person who has a common support and they remain valuable modal values and ultimate values...". Burns' vision on strength transformed leadership is like noble and in contrast of charismatic leadership on which is watching as to "heroic" leadership and otherwise of administrative or business leadership. Bernard Bass developed Burns' concept, transforming leadership in his book "Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations" into "transformative leadership, "in which the leader transforms followers. According to Bass, influence, or giving instruction unilaterally, unlike Burns's vision, is a double-sided process of possibility establishment. Bass looks back on transformational style leadership and executive management that incorporates social change. (Bolden, 2003).

In common research presented in the paper entitled "Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership", Bass and Avolio (2003) propose that "transformational leadership is a closer prototype of leadership that people they have in mind when describe of his/her own ideal leader, and it is possible that with this in style, subordinates will be able to identify more". 86 According to Bass and Avolio, Charisma is cited as the most important element of Bass' theories, from which they later proposed a new theory of leadership, which was conceived on theoretical Max Weber's postulates. Max Weber was the first to present the concept of charisma that appeared at the time of radical change and legalization in societies and organizations (Weber, 1922, 1947, 1968), from which later developed charismatic leadership, which requires leaders to possess charisma, to have the ability to motivate subordinates to realize tasks above expectations. Subordinates follow him because they think the leader has supernatural abilities. A charismatic leader is realistic in watching the future, and is most often defined as the ideal type, bureaucratic model, traditional model, and charismatic model of authority. It was a dynamic model that depicted how one form of model and organizations affect others. In addition, the model is cyclical, in which charisma is the most unstable form, prevailing after the charismatic revolution against favoritism, bureaucracy, and the power of the office. In addition, the literature contains statements that this model is situational, but this suggests an unstable situational theory. Charismatic leadership is defined much more shallowly than transformational leadership and refers to the follower's perception of the leader's ability to encourage subordinates' creativity. Followers not only trust the leader but also idolize him. Based on findings from psychology and political science, Robert House proposed a model of charismatic leadership in 1977 that distinguishes

the personality characteristics and behavior of charismatic and non-charismatic leaders. According to House (1977), indicators of charismatic leadership include: followers' faith in the correctness of the leader's beliefs, unconditional acceptance of the leader, love for the leader, and willing obedience. Therefore, in charismatic leadership, the focus is on the leader's personality and the leader themselves, rather than on the leadership process as such.

Broadly acceptable framework: Conger and Kanungo define charismatic leadership as characterized by four key characteristics: the possession and articulation of visions, the willingness to take on risks to realize those visions, sensitivity to followers' needs, and the demonstration of new ideas. Three conceptual questions are important to address. First, most works on charismatic leadership have grown out of Weber's view that charismatic leaders are rare or extraordinary. Conger (1989) believes that charisma "is not limited to magical ability, only certain handfuls of people". Trice and Beyer (1986) and Beyer (1999) explain that charismatic leaders are not domesticated, believing that charisma belongs to all individuals to varying degrees. But on the other hand, Judge and others (2006) believe that empirical research cannot be based on the belief that charisma quality, which they possess only a few, can be measured. Secondly, sure scientists approach distinction charisma as a characteristic or a personal quality of charismatic process leadership. House (1977) advocates a charismatic process of favoritism. Locke and Kirkpatrick (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996) clearly define charismatic style communications as a quality of other leadership. The latter, although Conger (1990) often described dark-side charismatic leadership, according to the rest of the literature, he seems to be alone in this view. It is evident that charismatic leadership is neither inherently good nor evil, but implicit citations in the literature suggest that it represents a positive strength in organizations (Vrdoljak Raguz, 2009).

House suggested a theory of charismatic leadership based on a series of assumptions that can be checked and, instead of folklore and mystique, processes that can be observed. Theory determines how charismatic managers behave, their characteristics and abilities, and the conditions under which they will most likely appear. One limitation of initial theories was that they were vague and process-based. Shamir, Hose, and Arthur (1993) revised and expanded this theory, incorporating changes in thinking about human motivation and a more detailed description of the process influence. About human motivation placed are these assumptions : (1) behavior expresses feelings, values and self - image some person, and it is also pragmatically and on goal directed ; (2) self - concept some persons is composed of a hierarchy social identity and values ; (3) people are intrinsically motivated to increase and protect yours self-esteem and own value and (4) people are intrinsically motivated to maintain compliance between different components idea about yourself, and between self - concept yours Charismatic behavior data management they are coming from relationship manager-subordinate. As in the previous theory, House (1977) found that a charismatic manager has deep and unusual effects on subordinates. Subordinate they think that they are manager's beliefs correct, they readily follow and listen, bow are, emotionally are tied with mission groups or organizations, have working and business goals and they believe they can contribute performance The manager is often asked attributed exceptional abilities, but contrary theory Conger and Kanunga (1987), such exceptional abilities are not considered necessary prerequisite for charismatic management. Characteristics and behavioral traits of the manager are key determinants of charismatic leadership. Charismatic managers have a strong need for power, great self-confidence, and a firm belief in their own beliefs and ideals. Management behavior who interpreters how charismatic

manager effects on attitudes and behavior followers include the following : (1) expression some attractive visions, (2) use strong, expressive shape communications on the occasion presentations visions, (3) download personal risks and contribution personal victims in order to realize that vision, (4) communication large expectations, (5) expression trust in subordinates, (6) modeling behaviors in line with the vision, (7) management impressions subordinates about the manager, (8) encouragement identification with the group or organization and (9) empowerment subordinates. (Yukl, 2008: 251).

Further research has sought to identify moderators of the relationships between charismatic and transformational leadership and different outcomes. The five leader—or follower—level outcomes that have been most researched are effectiveness (Fuller et al., 1996; Spreitzer, Pertulla, & Xin, 2005, Wofford, Whittington, & Goodwin, 2001), performance (Fuller et al., 1996; Whittington, Goodwin, & Murray, 2004), motivation (Felfe & Schyns, 2002), satisfaction (Fuller et al., 1996), and communication. (Meyer et al., 2002). Individual distinct variables identified as moderators of transformational leadership are goal setting, increased need for power, need for autonomy, and values. In one study (Whittington et al., 2004), it was determined that the definition of goals is indirectly conditioned by the effects of transformational leadership on performance and commitment, and that this definition strengthened their relationship. According to the studies, increases in power and autonomy needs also affect transformational leadership. Wofford et al. (2001) found that when employees' need for power and autonomy is high, transformational leadership is associated with group effectiveness. Furthermore, they found that increased power magnifies the effects of transformational leadership on leader satisfaction. Other research has investigated the moderating factors that shape the effects of transformational leadership. (Judge and all: 2006: 208-209).

Spreitzer et al. (2005) found that valuing traditionalism (overriding respect for hierarchy) moderated the relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates' ratings of effectiveness, such that transformational leaders were perceived as less effective when their superiors were traditionalists, both in the United States and Taiwan. Contextual variables may also moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and various outcomes. The effects of transformational leadership were found to vary by organizational sector. Lowe et al. (1996) found, through a meta-analysis, that the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and effectiveness was significantly stronger in public than in private organizations. Fuller et al. (1996) found that the indisputability of performance was significantly higher in student and military samples than in civilian samples. In contrast, perceived effectiveness was higher in military than in civilian samples. Equally, Judge and Piccolo (2004) argued that transformational leadership is more valuable in a military environment. Job characteristics also moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. (Judge et al., 2006).

Whittington et al. (2004) found that job enrichment, when supervisors act indirectly (i.e., through structural distance), substitutes for the effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment and relationships, and that the effect is more positive. Additional evidence that job characteristics moderate the impact of transformational leadership is provided by Felfe and Schyns (2002). They found that high task demands neutralize the relationship between transformational leadership and self-efficacy, such that the relationship is zero when task demands are high and negative when they are low. Finally, internal and external organizational contexts appear to influence the effect of transformational leadership. Felfe and Schyns found that climate moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and self-

efficacy, such that it is positive when the climate is favorable and adverse when it is unfavorable or poor. In terms of the external context, another study found that high levels of environmental uncertainty fostered a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and subordinates' perceptions of their performance (de Hoogh et al., 2004). Furthermore, the relationship between charismatic leadership and organizational profitability was stronger when the leader was the organization's owner than when he was a director or general manager (Judge et al., 2006).

Bass (1997) thinks that the effects of transformational leadership are universal, generalizing across cultures. Although research supports the universality of charismatic and transformational leadership, other research challenges the role charismatic leaders can play across cultures. GLOBE studies are especially valuable for understanding the cross-cultural importance of transformational leadership. Although there are certain variations in findings across cultures, results generally support the importance of charismatic or transformational leadership. Den Hartog and others (199, p. 250) conclude, " Combined results key GLOBE92 research and accompanying studies demonstrate several attributes reflecting charismatic/transformational leadership, universally confirming it as a contribution to effective leadership." Spacious and convincing support exists for the importance of transformational and charismatic leadership across different cultural environments. However, specific characteristics of national culture can affect perceptions, emergence, and effectiveness of these leadership styles. Stajkovic, Carpenter, and Graffin (2005) investigated data from older managers in the USA (individual culture) and China (collective culture). Results suggest that culture moderates a strong positive relationship between charismatic leadership and social networks. Walumba and Lawer (2003) found that collectivism moderates the relationships between transformational leadership and several work outcomes, such as work satisfaction, organizational dedication, and avoidance behavior, in a sample of Chinese, Japanese, and Kenyan workers. Furthermore, Javidian and Carl (2004) compared Iranian and Canadian managers. They found that Iranian managers were significantly lower ranked, indicating diversity in the manifestations of leadership behavior or in how they are interpreted (Judge et al., 2006, 209-2010).

Ultimately, Kotter and Heskett (1992) offered a perspective on adaptable and non-adaptable cultures. Adaptable cultures are more inclined to emphasize innovation, integrity, enthusiasm, teamwork, hard work, honest communication, and risk management. Non-adaptable cultures do not promote taking risks, innovation, or change, and are focused on efficiency and maintaining order. According to these characteristics, adaptable cultures are more inclined to lean towards effects and the emergence of charismatic leadership than non-adaptive cultures.

Authentic leadership

The roots of authentic leadership theory lie in transformational leadership theory. Authentic leadership theory seeks to integrate earlier ideas about effective leadership, with a particular focus on ethical leadership. Bass and Avolio (2010) have suggested two types of transformational leaders: the authentic transformational leader and the inauthentic leader (pseudo-transformational leader). A pseudo-transformational leader may appear to be a transformational leader, but is not authentic in implementing transformational actions and plans, and lacks the moral basis for a transformational leader. Avolio shows interest in a moral perspective as he begins to focus on authentic leadership development. According to Avolio, authentic leadership means "knowing oneself, being in tune with oneself, and having a positive and strong orientation towards one's own development and the development of

others." This means that authentic leaders know what they stand for and their values, are persistent in actions aligned with those values, and are always looking for ways to develop themselves and others. The idea of authentic leadership has attracted considerable attention from theorists and scholars in recent years (Shamir & Eilam, 2005; Avolio, Gardner, Luthans & Walumbwa, 2005; Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Avolio, 2007). According to them, authentic leaders have a high opinion of their values, beliefs, emotions, self-identity, and abilities. According to Yukl (2010), their actions are strongly defined by their values and beliefs, rather than by the desire to be liked and appreciated or to maintain their position. The core values for authentic leaders motivate them to do what is right and fair for their followers and to create a special kind of relationship with them that includes a high level of mutual trust, transparency, guidance towards value goals, and an emphasis on the well-being of followers and their development (Laguerre, 2010).

Most versions of this theory propose that people who follow authentic leaders share the leader's values and beliefs, and that followers recognize the leader's behavior as consistent with those values. The effectiveness of authentic leadership stems from its motivation, defined as energy, persistence, optimism, and clarity of purpose in the face of challenges, obstacles, and conflict. ⁹⁵ Because the theory is relatively new, authentic leadership theory has only a few studies that have directly investigated the antecedents, consequences, and enabling conditions for authentic leadership. Yukl (2010) argues that "the large number of variables in some versions of the theory and the emphasis on the development of authentic leadership suggest that intensive, long-term case studies would be more useful for this type of research than static questionnaire surveys." This means that developing an authentic leader takes time and is not a simple process. Avolio (2010) believes that leadership development is a process defined by both positive and negative moments, and that authentic leadership begins with specific events that lead to learning and would ultimately elevate leadership potential. Turner and Mavin (2000) conducted research in the Northeast region of Great Britain, gathering a qualitative empirical database through semi-structured interviews with 22 senior managers in leadership positions, using a life-history approach to examine how individuals establish and maintain leadership. The results indicated that the base emphasizes the elements of authentic leadership theory. The life stories of senior managers (leaders) and, in exceptional cases, certain events were key to their approach to leadership.

Furthermore, Shamir and Eilan (2005), drawing on the ideas of life stories presented by Bennis and Tomas (2002), Garder (1995), and Tichy (1997), argue that leaders acquire or realize specific characteristics as they develop, build, and view life stories and events. This means that if leaders are informed about the effectiveness that comes from looking to the past, it can lead them to become more effective leaders. Kegan (1982) believes that life stories can provide meaning to leaders by allowing them to act in ways that add personal meaning to their actions. As a result of the study, Turner and Mavin (2008) believe that instead of focusing on traditional models and theories of how to be a leader, a stronger approach to leadership development is to enable leaders to reflect on life stories and share them so that they can engage in meaningful creation of their approach and create their identity. Although the research included only 22 individual leaders, it demonstrated that a large number of participants' experiences contributed to the development of a leadership style towards the current role of leader. Facilitating multiple training programs to maintain reflective elements for the module would allow others to learn from each other's experiences.

Avolio et al. (2008) conducted a study that developed and tested the theory of authentic leadership using five separate samples from China, Kenya, and the United States. In one sample, 610 instrument packages were distributed to employees from 11 U.S. multinational organizations operating in Kenya. The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) was used for the study, which assessed the leader's personal knowledge, relationship transparency, moral perspective, and processing balance. Over a period of 6 weeks, participants first had to provide personal information (gender, age, etc.) on 16 items, which were rated by a supervisor using the ALQ questionnaire. Then, the same participants were rated on their job performance. The data indicated that authentic leadership is associated with higher satisfaction and job performance. This study found that the theory of authentic leadership is globally applicable. However, as with any recent theory, further development is needed, along with additional research to support the authentic theory of leadership (Yukl, 2010).

Conclusion

A review of expert research indicates that defining a leadership approach within a highly complex, multidimensional process is itself complex. Three leadership styles are commonly identified in the literature: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. The trait approach is rooted in the "great man" theory, which identifies the key characteristics of successful leaders. The "great man" theory is based on the belief that leaders are exceptional individuals with innate qualities, destined to lead. It was believed that through the aforementioned approach, critical leadership traits could be isolated and that people with such traits could be recruited and placed in leadership positions. The problem with the trait approach is that, as many traits have been identified, research has been conducted.

The behavioral approach is based on defining leader behavior; that is, what successful leaders do and how other employees perceive them. This approach examines the leader in the context of the organization, identifying leader behaviors that enhance the organization's effectiveness.

Stronghold situational theory holds that individual characteristics make leaders successful in certain situations. Theorists emphasize the need to consider the tasks and social-emotional needs of specific groups. Situational access significantly contributed to model leadership at the time it was created, since it opens the possibility of different access to leadership in each situation.

References

1. Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 25–33.
2. Avolio, B. J. (2010). Pursuing authentic leadership development. In N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership theory and practice* (pp. 739–765). Harvard Business Press.
3. Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338.
4. Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact followers. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801–823.
5. Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.
6. Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89–126.

7. Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(6), 827–832.
8. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
9. Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52*(2), 130–139.
10. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage.
11. Berson, Y., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*(3), 325–346.
12. Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 307–330.
13. Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A., & Dennison, P. (2003). *A review of leadership theory and competency frameworks*. University of Exeter, Centre for Leadership Studies.
14. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
15. Conger, J. A. (1989). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
16. Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*(2), 44–55.
17. Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(4), 637–647.
18. Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Sage.
19. De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2004). Charismatic leadership, environmental uncertainty, and organizational performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(1), 41–65.
20. Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 219–256.
21. Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2001). Leadership in organizations. In N. Anderson et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2). Sage.
22. Derel, M. (2003). A survey research on leadership styles of elementary school principals. Middle East Technical University.
23. Felfe, J., & Schyns, B. (2002). Personality and the perception of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(8), 1621–1634.
24. Fuller, J. B., Patterson, C. E., Hester, K., & Stringer, D. Y. (1996). A quantitative review of research on charismatic leadership. *Psychological Reports, 78*(1), 271–287.
25. House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Southern Illinois University Press.
26. House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 323–352.
27. Javidan, M., & Carl, D. E. (2004). East meets West: A cross-cultural comparison of charismatic leadership among Canadian and Iranian executives. *Journal of Management Studies, 41*(4), 665–691.
28. Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and charismatic leadership: A review and an agenda for future research. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie, 48*(4), 207–220.
29. Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Harvard University Press.
30. Kirkbride, P. (2006). Developing transformational leaders: The full range leadership model in action. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 38*(1), 23–32.
31. Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(1), 36–51.
32. Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. Free Press.
33. Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 385–425.

34. Manheim, E., & Halamish, B. (2008). Transformational leadership and follower development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(4), 317–335.
35. Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2002). Employee commitment and motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 99–115.
36. Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577–594.
37. Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 395–417.
38. Spreitzer, G. M., Pertulla, J., & Xin, K. (2005). Traditionality matters: An examination of the effectiveness of transformational leadership in the United States and Taiwan. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(2), 354–368.
39. Stajkovic, A. D., Carpenter, M. A., & Graffin, S. D. (2005). The social capital of American and Chinese top managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4), 444–461.
40. Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1997). *The transformational leader*. Wiley.
41. Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8(1), 113–164.
42. Turner, J., & Mavin, S. (2000). Leadership development through life stories. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(1), 41–49.
43. Turner, J., & Mavin, S. (2008). Unearthing leadership development: Taking the lid off leaders' life stories. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(4), 354–369.
44. Vrdoljak Raguž, I. (2009). *Međuvodstvo i uspješnosti poslovanja velikih hrvatskih poduzeća*. Split: Sveučilište u Splitu / izdavač.
45. Walumbwa, F. O., & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building effective organizations: Transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes and behaviors in US and non-US organizations. *Personnel Review*, 32(4), 380–406.
46. Weber, M. (1922/1947/1968). *Economy and society*. University of California Press.
47. Whittington, J. L., Goodwin, V. L., & Murray, B. (2004). Transformational leadership, goal difficulty, and job design. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 67–86.
48. Wofford, J. C., Whittington, J. L., & Goodwin, V. L. (2001). Follower motive patterns as determinants of outcomes in transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1190–1200.
49. Yukl, G. (2008). *Rukovođenje u organizacijama: Teorijske spoznaje, pojmovi, praktične smjernice*. Zagreb: Naklada Slap.
50. Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Pearson.

About the authors

Ana Udovičić is a college professor at the University of Applied Science in Šibenik. The author can be contacted at: ana_u@vus.hr

Fran Urem is a college professor with tenure, and he is also Vice Dean for Financial Affairs and Erasmus coordinator at the University of Applied Science in Šibenik. The author can be contacted at: frane.urem@vus.hr