Leadership Styles and Organizational Behavior

Carmen-Gabriela Secară
Alina-Ștefania Stroe
University of Pitești, Faculty of Economic Sciences and Law, Romania
carmen.secara@yahoo.com
alinastefania12@gmail.com

Abstract

The present paper proposes to investigate a potential relationship between the two variables specific to the human resources field: leadership and organizational behavior. Leadership refers on how the person invested with a certain power exteriorizes and behaves, derived from the position of the employed leadership, its predictability, fidelity, sustainability and the multitude of its particular characteristics. The perception over a leader it may be subject to errors of judgement and its nature may take a distorted form when the assumption on the subject is rather general, not specific. The uniqueness of each individual leader, alongside with his charisma, cannot be globalised, but need to be reported separately according to the group, the society and the field to which he is committed. On the other hand, organizational behavior brings with it a wide range of responsibilities, from knowing and meeting the needs of staff, to accepting and understanding the culture of each member of the organization.

Key words: diversity, leadership, organizational behavior, typologies
J.E.L. classification: L20, L22

1. Introduction

First of all, leadership is a behavioral complex, a typical activity profile of a person in a leading position of a group, organization, or community (Zamfir & Vlăsceanu, 1998, p.604).

On the other hand, organizational behavior has been conceptualized by Fritz Roethlisberger and Elton Mayo, which analyzed the relationships between individual and group behavior, as well as how they merge and express influence on labor productivity. This stands out for dynamism, energy, vivacity and progress. Since individual behavior has been expressed over time rather by personality subsystems, the collective one, which is also the subject of research, has been presented as: the conduct of several actors acting in a more or less coherent way to achieve a common goal (Gilles, 1998, p. 32).

The research carried out in this respect has been a major interest in the field of research and is differentiated because of the high exposure of the needs, shortcomings, strengths and vulnerabilities existing in the relationship of leadership - organizational behavior. It also adds value to the field of study by focusing on work in terms of both efficiency and effectiveness, and in terms of personal, situational and social factors. A distinct note of the research is also provided by the exposure of scientific evidence of professional stress, which the World Health Organization considers to be an occupational disease. Undoubtedly, dynamics of leadership - organizational behavior varies due to elements such as: interpersonal harmony, support, empathy, altruism, trust, communication, initiative and more.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. The personality trait-centered approach

Numerous research in leadership has focused on identifying those personal traits that can differentiate leaders from non-leaders. Their primary objective was to argue what an effective leader is, not how to run effectively. The initial presumptions were those that expressed that not everyone can lead, and the one who is „born" to lead has a number of specific characteristics both physically and psycho-socially. It found that there is a strong relationship between personality traits and perceptions of leadership style, with a large number of specialists believing that intelligence, male or female interests and dominance correlate with the ability to be a leader.

However, it is considered essential to take into account several factors in order to avoid generalization and erroneous judgments.

Although trait theory has not been successful in establishing an invariable set of particular traits that distinguish between a leader and a subordinate, it has brought to the fore the need to use personality tests and interview in the process of selecting managers. Moreover, it has established the ideal qualities and abilities to be considered in order to occupy a certain position.

2.2. Behavior-centered approach

Within this approach, exploring a leader's behavior represented the key concept. In this sense, interest has derived from identifying the tasks that an effective leader can solve and not from the features that he or she would need. Research by the University of Ohio and the University of Michigan has revealed a number of essential issues.

Ohio University has brought to the fore the concepts of: Initiation of the structure, respectively consideration. Structure initiation refers to leadership behaviors derived from the establishment of procedures and ways to achieve organizational objectives and as the ability to consistently direct the work of the working group.

At the opposite pole, consideration refers to the motivational process of each person, to what satisfies him in relation to the activity carried out and to the homogeneity of the group. Within this dimension, the role of the leader is to focus on the organizational climate and the needs of the staff. The two dimensions, the initiation of structure and consideration, combine in such a way that they „give rise" to four distinct types of leadership.

The first model attests the existence of a close relationship between behavioral variations of a leader and the performance of the work group. In order to achieve an optimal level of satisfaction, the ideal situation is represented by the high level on both dimensions: structure and consideration.

The second model reveals that regardless of the combinations made, a high level of consideration is always associated with a high level of satisfaction.

The third model expresses that the effectiveness and attitude of a leader depends on the nature and size of the group. Depending on the numerical character of the group, adopting one dimension or another will create varying effects.

The latter model establishes that the two dimensions coexist and have an interdependence ratio.

On the other hand, the University of Michigan has established that there are two types of leaders: production-centered and employee-centered, with the chosen orientation being in most situations and faithful.

The orientation on production attests the leader's concern for achieving performance as well as the focus on working methods, a specific note of which is the supervision of the staff activity.

It is the orientation of leaders on employees that values team spirit, communication between group members, involvement of staff in decision-making and cultivation of mutual respect, trust and devotion.

2.3. The theory of behavioral continuum

The theory elaborated and developed by Rensis Likert assumes the existence of four styles of leadership: the exploitative-authoritarian style; the benevolent-authoritarian style; the advisory style and the participative style.

The exploitative-authoritarian style is identified by the hierarchical level of power (up-down), frequent punishments and threats, poor communication process, lack of group cohesion and minimal productivity.

The benevolent-authoritarian style differs from the previous one through greater indulgence at the decision-making level and counterproductive phenomena: absenteeism, fluctuation of personnel and low productivity.

The advisory style is identified by effective communication, regardless of the hierarchical level, promoting group values such as cohesion, dynamism and unity, high satisfaction, high motivation and increased productivity.

Participative style is identified by hypercomplexity, promotion of the principles and participation of the group in the work activities, efficient, full communication and maximum productivity.

2.4. Cognitive theory

Starting from the importance of the decision-making process and from the hypothesis that it is rather social because it targets interactions, events and social situations, the specialists evaluated not only the ability of leaders to solve problems, but they also created a model meant to attest to their orientation on two types of problems: group and individual.

The decision-making model of Victor Vroom and collaborators revealed the existence of the following leadership styles:

Autocratic style I expresses the fact that the leader solves problems and makes decisions on his own using the information held at that time.

Autocratic style II expresses the fact that the leader uses information obtained from his subordinates, but he also makes the decision on his own. They are not aware of the problem, their role being only to provide solutions.

The advisory style I attests the fact that the leader informs the subordinates about the problem, accepting ideas, solutions, proposals, but only individually, not collectively to make a decision.

The advisory style II demonstrates that the leader informs on the problem, accepts ideas, solutions and proposals, but only in a group way, in order to reach a decision.

The group style highlights the fact that the leader assigns the problem to his subordinates, as a group, evaluating it together and reaching a common denominator. The leader's concerns are to direct, maintain and fix the crucial points of the problem, being equally interested in accepting and implementing the solution supported by the whole group.

2.5. Path-goal theory

The fundamental principle of the „path-goal" theory is that a person has the ability to engage behaviorally in various functions when there are facilitating conditions. Starting from this aspect, the proposed model targets the leadership styles approached by a leader, the particularities of subordinates and environmental factors.

In this regard, the following typologies are outlined: directive styles (involves the free interpretation by subordinates of work tasks); supportive style (aims at the relationship of equality between leader and subordinates); participative style (involves consulting subordinates before making decisions) and achievement-oriented style (expresses concern for setting and meeting goals, towards the achievement of the optimum performance and towards the continuous progress).

The characteristics of the subalterns refer to the experience and skills they hold for one function or another, while environmental factors express the type of professional task, the working group and the means by which authority is structured.

The „path-purpose" theory differs from the other theories by the coexistence of the organizational, cognitive and motivational dimension, as well as by the decisive impact they have on the working climate. This surprises by highlighting the inter-human differences regarding the satisfaction and performance in work.

2.6. Organizational behavior

Workplace behavior is a fundamental component of the organizational environment. According to specialized research, organizational behavior encompasses all actions and interactions of members of an organization that can directly or indirectly affect its progress. This represents in equal measure

also a reaction to particular or general situations that people come into contact with within the corporation.

Healthy organizational behavior is the one that derives from solid, sustainable, inclined and based on human values interpersonal relationships, from support, equity, respect and tolerance, aspects that make it possible to orient toward performance and evolution.

There are a number of internal and external factors that influence workplace behavior and can have unintended effects on the entire organization.

In addition to leadership style, there are other variables involved in generating behaviors, such as organizational culture, professional responsibilities, communication, personal life and workplace relationships.

Organizational culture comes to be directly responsible for the degree of comfort, harmony and joy experienced by people in the workplace. Being made up of attitudes, behaviors, beliefs, habits, thoughts, values, rules and regulations, this requires transparency and provides security. Strong and stable organizational cultures are defining for professional development and sustainability. Research shows that high levels of organizational culture determine behaviors by which people manage to cope with difficult, crisis situations, to enjoy a sense of belonging to a group and feel protected.

In turn, professional responsibilities determine the emergence of varied behaviors. Not by chance, positioning the right man in the right place is a wise decision that favors achieving the yield in the shortest possible time. When people benefit from guidance, being directed toward training and developing professional skills, they end up being much more informed, self-assured, much more committed to work and productivity and not least much more connected to the idea of self-actualization. Otherwise, we will have to deal with exploitation, overuse, confusion, poor quality of work, lability, passive or aggressive behavioral responses that will alter the whole way things work. The goal of management is, among other things, to correctly trace tasks and distribute them according to the skills of each individual, to avoid victimization, frustration, misconceptions and turning the entire working environment into a hazard.

Effective communication requires not only a bilateral report, but also the identification of the best method of issuing and receiving information. Within an organization, decisions, dispositions, suggestions and opinions must be clear to avoid multiple interpretations.

Human behavior changes when people notice that they are being avoided, unwanted, and may end up feeling unimportant, abandoned, and this can lead them to act in various ways. It is not in the advantage of the organization for staff to lose interest in their professional activity on the basis of this consideration, as it may at any time express personal discontent, displeasure and dissatisfaction in the most inappropriate and harmful manner possible.

In terms of personal life, studies have shown that most family problems determine the expression of irrational behaviors in the workplace. Unfortunately, situations that people face outside the profession cause them to be anxious, stressed, tense, to have no results and even „explode" at certain times toward others. Most of the time, when personal life is stable, the behaviors adopted at work are pleasant, inclined towards altruism and empathy.

Finally, workplace relationships reflect both people's social needs and the existence of partnerships, regardless of their sentimental nature, built on sincerity, devotion and values, common ideals. In the case of isolation or self-isolation, the behaviors emitted become disagreeable and harmful to others. Studies show that high levels of inter-human relationships generate energy for the professional environment, outline distinct visions and ensure a harmonious overall climate for all involved.

Organizational behavior is assimilated to collective behavior and must be observed from several angles, taking into account the degree of organization, objective, duration and social acceptance.

Gustave Le Bon's law of mental unity of the masses (2007) explains collectivity in terms of emotions, feelings, thoughts, intentions, and actions of those in the crowd that end up being unanimous. Collectivity implies identical principles, characteristics and ways of achieving goals that make possible the occurrence of the phenomenon of mental contagion. In the event of this contagion, principles, beliefs and opinions are unconsciously accepted. Thus, collective thoughts and actions can determine positive or negative behaviors, in their consistency, the degree of maturity and emotional stability being defining.

2.7. Cognitive dissonance and the theory of planned behavior

The theory of planned actions expresses that in most situations, behavioral predictions can be made based on behavioral intentions. Starting from the assumption that people are rational and the behavior emitted is guided by information, knowledge and attitudes, it is concluded that intentions derive from thought behavior. It is also noted that attitude changes depending on the rewards or losses that a certain behavior brings. When there are several conflicting thoughts, people experience unpleasant psychological states.

On the other hand, the theory of cognitive dissonance targets those behaviors that are not consistent with the person's attitudes, creates discomfort and causes attitudes to be modified in such a way that they are consistent with the behavior. Research has shown that the prohibition of certain behaviors does not cause their change in reaction, but what will make the difference will be the advice, the recommendation in this regard. Because the adaptation of the human being to the environment in which they live is not exactly easy, attitudes and behaviors end up conditioning each other.

Undoubtedly, there are other factors that can determine the prediction of behavior, such as the degree of coercion, social pressure, and the possibility that the situations people have gone through will recur.

From an organizational point of view, careful observation of staff can make it possible to infer future behaviors.

3. Research methodology

Organizational progress is ensured by a multitude of specific elements, including both the ability of the leader to manage the problems and situations they face, from the best known to unpredictable, as well as the organizational behavior in their hypercomplexity.

That is why, in the present paper, we have set out to look at the specific features of leadership style, the heterogeneity of human behavior, in organizational terms, and the potential relationship between the two multiple subaspects, specific to the field of interest: communication, professional stress, organizational culture, influence and power.

The applicative objectives of the paper were to identify the predominant leadership style at the organizational level; to evaluate organizational behavior and to determine the possible relationships between the predominant leadership style and organizational behavior, with the help of appropriate tools aimed at evaluating variables.

The general hypothesis was that there is a relationship between leadership styles and organizational behavior.

In addition, the working hypotheses were that:

- There is a positive, statistically significant correlation between participative leadership style and autocratic behavior;
- There is a positive, statistically significant correlation between participative leadership style and paternal behavior;
- There is a positive, statistically significant correlation between participative leadership style and supportive behavior;
- There is a positive, statistically significant correlation between participative leadership style and collegial behavior;
- There is a positive, statistically significant correlation between authoritarian leadership style and autocratic behavior;
- There is a statistically significant positive correlation between authoritarian leadership style and paternal behavior;
- There is a positive, statistically significant correlation between authoritarian leadership style and supportive behavior;
- There is a positive, statistically significant correlation between authoritarian leadership style and collegial behavior.

Quantitative research has focused on the development of a questionnaire, with the method of collecting data being psychometric. Its objective was to collect information relevant to assessing both leadership and organizational behavior from 70 employees located in Argeș country, with ages, backgrounds and various professions. We wanted to shape rigorous, extensive analysis that includes employees from organizations with a distinct profile. The data collected was used to identify a possible relationship between the two research variables: leadership and organizational behavior.

Regarding the tools used, the questionnaire for the leadership style variable, „T-P Leadership Questionnaire", respectively the questionnaire for the organizational behavior variable, „Organizational Behavior Survey" offered to employees for completion, laid the foundation for the academic approach.

„T-P Leadership Questionnaire" focuses on the characteristics of leadership style, by highlighting two types of guidance: people-oriented (P) and task-oriented (T). The two guidelines focus on participative leadership and authoritarian leadership. The questionnaire consists of 35 items, located on a Likert-type scale, with five possible answers, as follows: always; often; occasional; rare; never.

„Organizational Behavior Survey" focuses on organizational behavior, by highlighting four types of behavior in which the organization engages: autocratic, paternal, supportive and collegial. The questionnaire consists of 20 items, on a Likert-type scale, with five possible answers, as follows: almost never; rare; occasional; frequent; almost every time.

4. Findings

The hypercomplexity of the organizational environment, together with its vitality, is expressed by the multitude of interacting factors at the level of the professional activity carried out by people. In this respect, the research developed focuses on leadership and organizational behavior, with the related statistical processes constituting a solid argument in the academic approach.

We wanted in this way to follow the human being closely in the laborious process of work and to identify what it is experiencing, what changes would like, what feelings might have in relation of its work activity, what visions and prospects would have in relation with the subject of interest, how would like to be perceived by the leader, what expectations would have from him and especially what motivates him to go, day by day, further, despite all the obstacles.

Far from the already renowned information, the report leadership - organizational behavior is also fundamental in terms of the quality of human life. Leadership uses varied typologies with multiple particularities in terms of both efficiency and effectiveness, as well as in terms of satisfaction, motivation, degree of authority, degree of assertiveness, degree of aggressiveness and organizational climate.

Thus, the classical approach to leadership style (Lewin, Lippitt & White) provides the existence of three distinct styles: authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire. The specific features were developed by them, taking into account: satisfaction, efficiency and group dynamics. The first style is distinguished by efficiency, goal orientation, multiple work tasks, control, assertive attitude and often by employee dissatisfaction, tension and predisposition to conflict.

The second style involves the leader's orientation toward people, toward their needs, toward the creation of a favorable working environment for evolution, development and toward general positive attitudes.

On the other hand, organizational behavior is closely related to both the leadership style approached and the professional activity itself. There are many factors that influence the appearance of one behavior at the expense of the other, and according to the literature, in order to create positive, agreeable behaviors, oriented toward accomplishment and professional success, equally positive attitudes are needed to cultivate them. In other words, in order to achieve what is desired from a behavioral point of view, leaders need to display the behavior that employees would want and would cause them to act in the optimal manner.

In this respect, Pearson correlation, as a process of inference statistics, the one aimed at testing the working hypotheses mentioned in the previous chapter, determined the existence of positive correlation, statistically significant, only in the case of two working hypotheses. Thus, the hypothesis attesting that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between authoritarian leadership style and autocratic behavior has been confirmed because Sig = 0,029, where, Sig ≤ 0,05.

One possible explanation for this is that authoritarian leadership style is precisely the one for which productivity and organizational objectives prevail over people. This style, which involves conducting the entire professional activity and in which the subordinates are not entitled to reply, are not involved in the decision-making process, they are not consulted on the decisions made, nor do they matter in terms of ideas they could express and emit at work, is unfortunately associated with appropriate behavior. Respondents believe that this style of leadership imposes an autocratic behavior, characterized by satisfying the leader's need for power, attitudes such as „the order is executed, not discussed", his obvious inclination to ask for things, without giving, using threats and penalties that cause employees to obey, but not to give respect to it.

Table no.1. The correlation between authoritarian leadership style and autocratic behavior

		Stil de conducere autoritar	Comportament autocratic
Stil de conducere autoritar	Pearson Correlation	1	,262[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,029
	N	70	70
Comportament autocratic	Pearson Correlation	,262[*]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,029	
	N	70	70

Source: Created by the authors through the statistical software S.P.S.S in order to test one of the working hypotheses

At the opposite end, the hypothesis that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between participative leadership style and supportive behavior has been confirmed, since $Sig = 0,011$, where $Sig \leq 0,05$.

The arguments that support the hypothesis are that the right attitude of a leader is a small detail that makes a major and significant difference.

Thus, directing the leader toward human needs, integrating them into decision-making, effective communication, conflict prevention and mediation, cultivating self-motivation, encouraging growth and development of human potential, both personally and professionally, together with its deeply generous and benevolent attitude, represent a predictor in establishing organizational behavior.

The interpersonal abilities of the leader also play a decisive role in the report under consideration as they refer to: support, availability, flexibility, optimism, future orientation, initiative to align personal and organizational interests in the desire to create a unitary whole and to establish a working environment.

In the end, looking for the background and not the shape, looking beyond stereotypes, being open and visionary and considering man the measure of everything is what determines evolution.

Table no.2. The correlation between participative leadership style and supportive behavior

		Stil de conducere participativ	Comportament suportiv
Stil de conducere participativ	Pearson Correlation	1	-,304[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,011
	N	70	70
Comportament suportiv	Pearson Correlation	-,304[*]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,011	
	N	70	70

Source: Created by the authors through the statistical software S.P.S.S in order to test one of the working hypotheses

5. Conclusions

„Leadership Styles and Organizational Behavior" represent the research that has been aimed at analyzing how the two variables interact and determine the effects of leadership on organizational behavior, as well as the validity, energy charge that this report provides to the environment in which it is deployed.

A healthy leadership at the organizational level, according to the specialists, is the one which identifies itself through equity in attributing tasks, knowledge and taking on roles, duties, obligations, objectives, successes and failures, and undeniably focus on the needs of the human being - authentic human being, incomparable, with reference systems and multiple perspectives, with personal ideals and dissatisfaction, but for which appreciation and valuing the true standards produces the wonders of tomorrow.

The general hypothesis of the research, which aims at the relationship between leadership styles and organizational behavior, an approach to which 70 respondents contributed, of which, 33 females and 37 males, from Argeș County, aged between 20 - 42 years, with distinct backgrounds and professions, has led to multiple results.

It was found that the two leadership styles: authoritarian and participative, respectively, are associated with specific behaviors, in the case of the former, major control by the leader, huge responsibilities, planning and forecasting targets, lack of support and understanding, along with minimal consideration of subordinates, reveals a socially unpleasant behavior and can always lead to the same type of behavior on the part of employees.

In the case of the second style, the participative one, the quality of life of the employees is considerably improved, the support they have from the leader making them feel that they are part of a real family and that their opinion matters. It is fundamental for people to be treated properly, to know that thanks to them society is prosperous and that they can always lay the foundations for great, bold goals, because a good leader has taken care to make them notice this.

The participative leadership style is also the one that is differentiated by the courage it offers people to be heard, by obtaining what is he wants without resorting to force and through the correct vision of the situations he faces.

From the perspective of the limitations of the study, we mention: the small number of participants that makes it impossible to generalize the result at the level of the population, the backgrounds of the subjects, the way in which they can respond to the social performance for fear of not being evaluated, age, education level and subjective particularities.

6. References

- Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M., 2004. Questions Raised by a Reasoned Action Approach: Comment on Ogden. *Health Psychology*, 23(4), pp. 431-434.
- Armstrong, M., 2006. *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. 10th Edition. London: Kogan Page Publishing.
- Bădescu, A., Mirci, C. and Bögre, G., 2008. *Managementul resurselor umane [Human resources management]*. Timișoara: Brumar Publishing House.
- Brief, A.P. and Weiss, H.M., 2002. Organizational Behavior: Affect in the Workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, pp. 279-307.
- Dodu, M., Raboca, H. and Tripon, C., 2013. *Managementul resurselor umane [Human resources management]*. Cluj-Napoca: "Babeș-Bolyai" University Publishing House.
- Ferréol, G., 1998. *Dicționar de sociologie [Dictionary of sociology]*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- French, J.R.P., Jr. and Raven, B., 1959. The Bases of Social Power. *Studies in social power*, pp. 150-167.
- Glazer, S. and Liu, C., 2017. Work, Stress, Coping, and Stress Management. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, G.S. and Mitchell, R. T., 1979. Attributional processes of leaders in leader - member interactions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 23(3), pp. 429-458.
- House, R.J., 1971. A Path Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3), pp. 321-339.

- Ivancevich, J.M., Konopaske, R. and Matteson, M.T., 2014. *Organizational Behavior & Management*. Tenth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Le Bon, G., 2007. *Psihologia mulțimilor [The psychology of crowds]*. Prahova: Antet XX Press Publishing House.
- Lord, R.G., de Vader, C. L. and Alliger, G.M., 1986. A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), pp. 402-410.
- Luthans, F., 2011. *Organizational Behavior An Evidence - Based Approach*. 12th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Manolescu, A., 2001. *Managementul resurselor umane [Human resources management]*, 3rd Edition. Bucharest: Economic Publishing House.
- Moscovici, S., 1997. *Psihologia socială sau mașina de fabricat zei [Social psychology or the god-making machine]*. Iași: "Al. I. Cuza" University Publishing House.
- Neculau, A., 1996. *Psihologie socială - Aspecte contemporane [Social psychology - Contemporary aspects]*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Neculau, A., 2001. *Dinamica grupurilor [Group dynamics]*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Pânișoară, G. and Pânișoară, I.O., 2016. *Managementul resurselor umane. [Human resources management]* Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Pasamar, S., Díaz-Fernández, M. and Dolores de la Rosa-Navarro, M., 2019. Human capital: the link between leadership and organizational learning. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 28(1), pp. 25-51.
- Popoviciu, S., 2013. *Psihologie socială. O abordare contextuală a individului ca actor social [Social psychology. A contextual approach to the individual as a social actor]*. Oradea: Emanuel University Publishing House.
- Rousseau, D.M., 1997. Organizational Behavior in the New Organizational Era. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, pp. 515-546.
- Schein, E.H., 2004. *Organizational culture and leadership*. Third Edition. New Jersey: The Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.
- Sinha, J.B.P., 2008. *Culture and Organizational Behavior*. India: Sage Publications India.
- Stanciu, Ș. and Ionescu, M.A., 2005. *Cultură și comportament organizațional [Culture and Organizational Behavior]*. Bucharest: Comunicare.ro Publishing House.
- Vroom, V.H. and Jago, A.G., 1974. Leadership and Decision Making. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 18(4). pp. 743-755.
- Yukl, G., 2013. *Leadership in Organizations*. Eighth Edition. London: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Zamfir, C. and Vlăsceanu, L., 1998. *Dicționar de sociologie [Dictionary of sociology]*. Bucharest: Babel Publishing House.
- Zlate, M., 2004. *Leadership și management [Leadership and management]*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Zlate, M., 2007. *Tratat de psihologie organizațional – managerială [Treatise on organizational - managerial psychology]*, 3rd volume. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.
- Zoltán, B., 2004. *Manual de psihologia muncii și organizațională [Handbook of work and organizational psychology]*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House.