

Connected by Purpose: How Organizational Effectiveness Relates to Leadership Styles and Employee Engagement in a Philippine Public Welfare Agency

¹Edgar G. Requilme and ²Nenita I. Prado

¹Student, Liceo de Cagayan University

²Professor, Liceo de Cagayan University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0452>

Received: 15 July 2026; Accepted: 20 July 2026; Published: 27 July 2026

ABSTRACT

Whether the leadership employees experience and the engagement they bring to their work are significantly associated with organizational outcomes remains an empirical question that Philippine public-sector research has largely left unanswered. This study examined the relationship between organizational effectiveness and the sub-variables of leadership styles and employee engagement among employees of the Department of Social Welfare and Development Field Office 10 (DSWD-10), Northern Mindanao, Philippines. Employing a quantitative correlational design, data were collected from 350 employees selected through stratified random sampling and analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlation. Four leadership styles (transformational, transactional, servant, and democratic) and four engagement dimensions (vigor, dedication, absorption, and commitment) were correlated with three organizational effectiveness outcomes: job satisfaction, workplace productivity, and service quality. Findings showed that all twenty-four correlations were positive and statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis for every pairing. Two distinct relational patterns emerged. Leadership styles correlated most strongly with job satisfaction, led by servant and democratic leadership, and only moderately with workplace productivity and service quality, where democratic leadership was consistently the strongest style. Employee engagement, by contrast, associated robustly with all three outcomes, with commitment the strongest correlate of job satisfaction and dedication the strongest correlate of both workplace productivity and service quality. The study concludes that leadership relates most proximally to how employees experience their work, while engagement is most closely associated with what employees produce and deliver. The findings affirm the Full Range Leadership Theory, Servant and Democratic Leadership perspectives, and the Job Demands-Resources Model, and identify commitment- and dedication-building as high-leverage points for public welfare institutions.

Keywords: leadership styles, employee engagement, organizational effectiveness, correlation, job satisfaction, workplace productivity, service quality, public sector

INTRODUCTION

Public welfare agencies stake their institutional performance on two human factors: the quality of leadership their supervisors provide and the engagement their employees sustain. Yet in the Philippine public sector, the empirical connection between these factors and organizational outcomes remains largely assumed rather than demonstrated. Local research on leadership and engagement concentrates heavily on private organizations such as business process outsourcing firms, hospitals, and schools, and international evidence, while extensive, comes predominantly from Western and corporate settings whose institutional logic differs markedly from a developing-country welfare bureaucracy. Before agencies invest in leadership development or engagement programming, a prior question deserves an evidence-based answer, namely, whether leadership styles and engagement dimensions significantly covary with job satisfaction, workplace productivity, and service quality in this setting, and if so, which pairings are strongest.

Answering this question matters for three reasons. First, resources for organizational development in government are scarce, and correlational evidence identifies where interventions are most plausibly connected to outcomes. Second, the engagement literature has tended to cast engagement as a mediating consequence of leadership rather than examining its own direct associations with organizational outcomes (Saks, 2019), leaving open whether engagement dimensions relate to effectiveness as strongly as, or more strongly than, leadership itself. Third, different outcomes may have different correlates: the style most strongly associated with employee satisfaction may not be the one most closely linked to productivity or service quality, and undifferentiated leadership development programs risk overlooking these distinctions.

Theoretically, the expected associations are well grounded. Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Theory links transformational and transactional behaviors to follower motivation and performance, a proposition supported meta-analytically in the public sector (Backhaus & Vogel, 2022; Fischer & Sitkin, 2023). Greenleaf's Servant Leadership Theory predicts that leaders who prioritize follower growth generate satisfaction and service quality (Saadah & Agustiyara, 2024), while Gastil's Democratic Leadership Perspective connects shared decision-making to productivity and cooperative performance (Costa et al., 2023). On the engagement side, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model holds that vigor, dedication, and absorption energize performance when resources are adequate (Bakker et al., 2023; Tang et al., 2024), and Social Exchange Theory frames commitment as reciprocation that employees repay through effort and quality work (Cropanzano et al., 2017). What these frameworks have rarely received, however, is a simultaneous, sub-variable-level correlational test against three distinct effectiveness outcomes within a single public welfare workforce.

The Department of Social Welfare and Development Field Office 10 (DSWD-10), the lead implementer of social protection programs across Northern Mindanao's five provinces, provides that testing ground. Its predominantly young, mission-driven, and largely non-regular workforce delivers services whose quality directly affects vulnerable communities, giving practical urgency to the question of which human factors are most strongly associated with institutional outcomes. This article reports the correlational component of a larger dissertation study on leading across a multigenerational workforce; the descriptive workforce profile, the regression-based identification of unique predictors, and the structural model of organizational effectiveness are reported in separate companion papers. Because generational cohort is a categorical variable unsuited to Pearson correlation, its predictive value is examined through dummy-variable regression in the companion predictors paper.

Statement of the Problem and Hypothesis

This study determined the relationship between organizational effectiveness and the sub-variables of leadership styles and employee engagement among employees of DSWD-10. Specifically, it sought to answer the question: Is there a significant relationship between organizational effectiveness, in terms of job satisfaction, workplace productivity, and service quality, and the sub-variables of leadership styles (transformational, transactional, servant, and democratic) and employee engagement (vigor, dedication, absorption, and commitment)?

The following null hypothesis was tested at the 0.05 level of significance: H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between organizational effectiveness and the sub-variables of leadership styles and employee engagement.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A quantitative correlational design was used to establish the strength and direction of the associations between the independent variables and organizational effectiveness. Correlational designs are appropriate when the objective is to quantify how variables covary in their natural state without manipulation, and they supply the empirical grounding required before predictive or structural claims can be advanced. The analysis reported here forms part of a larger predictive-correlational dissertation study.

Setting, Participants, and Sampling

The research site was DSWD Field Office 10, headquartered in Cagayan de Oro City and operating field and satellite offices throughout Misamis Occidental, Misamis Oriental, Camiguin, Lanao del Norte, and Bukidnon. Of the 2,784 employees in the regional, satellite, and operations offices, 350 respondents were drawn using Slovin's formula at a 5% margin of error and selected via stratified random sampling with office assignment as the stratification variable, each stratum sampled proportionally to its size (Taherdoost, 2016).

Instruments, Validity, and Reliability

Standardized instruments, each adapted to the DSWD-10 context, generated the study's measures. Transformational and transactional leadership were captured with an adapted Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Garzón-Lasso et al., 2024); servant leadership with the Servant Leadership Scale (Grobler & Flotman, 2020); and democratic leadership with an adapted democratic leadership instrument (Pažur, 2020). Vigor, dedication, and absorption were measured through an expanded Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli et al., 2019), and commitment to organizational goals through items adapted from Meyer and Allen's Affective Commitment Scale. The three effectiveness outcomes were operationalized with an adapted Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form (job satisfaction), an adapted Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (workplace productivity; Koopmans et al., 2014; van der Vaart & Linde, 2021), and an adapted SERVQUAL-based public-sector instrument (service quality; Zahri et al., 2023). A four-member expert panel affirmed the content validity of all items, and a pilot administration with thirty non-sample employees returned Cronbach's alpha coefficients between 0.807 and 0.985, indicating excellent internal consistency.

Data Collection and Ethical Considerations

Data gathering proceeded upon approval of the DSWD-10 Regional Director and in coordination with division heads, using both electronic and printed questionnaires. Respondents participated voluntarily after giving informed consent, with confidentiality and anonymity guaranteed; results were reported only in aggregate, in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173).

Data Analysis

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed between each of the eight independent sub-variables and each of the three organizational effectiveness outcomes, tested two-tailed at the 0.05 level of significance. Coefficient magnitudes were interpreted using conventional benchmarks in which values of approximately .10 denote small, .30 moderate, and .50 or greater strong associations. Generational cohort, being categorical, was excluded from the correlational analysis and treated through dummy-variable regression in the companion study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Levels of the Study Variables

Before the relationships among the variables are examined, the levels of leadership styles, employee engagement, and organizational effectiveness are first presented to establish the parameters entering the correlational analysis; the full item-level profile of the DSWD-10 workforce is reported in the companion descriptive paper of this research program.

Table 1. Summary Table on the Level of Leadership Styles

Leadership Style Dimension	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating
Transformational Leadership	4.31	0.793	High
Transactional Leadership	4.24	0.812	High

Servant Leadership	4.26	0.814	High
Democratic Leadership	4.29	0.760	High
Grand Mean	4.28	0.795	High

Scale: 4.51–5.00 Very High; 3.51–4.50 High; 2.51–3.50 Moderately High; 1.51–2.50 Low; 1.00–1.50 Very Low.

Table 1 shows that all four leadership styles were rated High, with a grand mean of 4.28 and dimensional means tightly clustered between 4.24 (transactional) and 4.31 (transformational). Rather than favoring a single approach, DSWD-10 supervisors are perceived to deploy transformational, transactional, servant, and democratic behaviors in combination, consistent with the Full Range Leadership Theory's premise that effective leaders integrate behavioral strategies contextually (Backhaus & Vogel, 2022; Fischer & Sitkin, 2023). This uniformly high, multi-style profile supplies the leadership parameters whose associations with organizational effectiveness are tested below.

Table 2. Summary Table on the Level of Employee Engagement

Engagement Dimension	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating
Vigor and Energy at Work	4.20	0.817	High
Dedication	4.62	0.669	Very High
Absorption in Tasks	4.07	0.862	High
Commitment to Organizational Goals	4.29	0.825	High
Grand Mean	4.30	0.793	High

Table 2 indicates that employee engagement was High overall (grand mean = 4.30), with dedication standing alone at the Very High level ($M = 4.62$) while vigor, absorption, and commitment were all High. The profile portrays a workforce that derives strong meaning and pride from social welfare work, in line with the Job Demands-Resources Model's account of engagement flourishing in meaningful work (Bakker et al., 2023) and Social Exchange Theory's view of commitment as reciprocation for favorable treatment (Cropanzano et al., 2017). These four dimensions constitute the engagement parameters for the correlational analysis.

Table 3. Summary Table on the Level of Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational Effectiveness Dimension	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating
Job Satisfaction	4.11	0.634	High
Workplace Productivity	4.45	0.609	High
Service Quality	4.45	0.600	High

Table 3 reveals that organizational effectiveness was High across its three dimensions, with workplace productivity ($M = 4.45$) and service quality ($M = 4.45$) exceeding job satisfaction ($M = 4.11$). The agency thus performs and serves at a somewhat higher level than its employees are satisfied, a gap traceable to compensation, recognition, and career development constraints documented in the companion descriptive study. These three outcomes serve as the dependent parameters against which the leadership and engagement sub-variables are correlated.

Relationship Between Organizational Effectiveness and the Leadership and Engagement Sub-variables

Table 4. Relationship Between Organizational Effectiveness Outcomes and Leadership Style and Employee Engagement Sub-variables

Variable / Sub-variable	Job Satisfaction (r)	Workplace Productivity (r)	Service Quality (r)
Leadership Styles			
Transformational	0.685	0.485	0.509
Transactional	0.719	0.508	0.518
Servant	0.725	0.503	0.514
Democratic	0.723	0.556	0.564
Employee Engagement			
Vigor	0.685	0.633	0.616
Dedication	0.643	0.701	0.726
Absorption	0.580	0.585	0.551
Commitment	0.758	0.656	0.665

All coefficients are significant at $p < .001$ (two-tailed), $n = 350$.

Significance and Direction of the Relationships

As Table 4 shows, every one of the twenty-four correlations between the independent sub-variables and the organizational effectiveness outcomes was positive and statistically significant at $p < .001$, warranting the rejection of H_{0i} for all pairings. No coefficient fell below $r = .485$, meaning that even the weakest observed association approaches the conventional threshold for a strong relationship. In a workforce of 350 employees spanning five provinces and multiple office types, this uniformity is itself a substantive finding: higher perceived leadership of any measured style, and higher engagement on any measured dimension, consistently co-occur with higher job satisfaction, workplace productivity, and service quality. The result empirically validates, within a Philippine public welfare setting, the foundational claims of the Full Range Leadership Theory, Servant Leadership Theory, and the Democratic Leadership Perspective that leadership behavior is meaningfully associated with organizational performance (Backhaus & Vogel, 2022; Fischer & Sitkin, 2023), as well as the JD-R Model's core proposition that engagement is significantly related to organizational outcomes (Bakker et al., 2023; Tang et al., 2024).

Relationships of the Leadership Styles with the Effectiveness Outcomes

A clear asymmetry characterizes the leadership correlations. All four styles associated strongly with job satisfaction ($r = .685$ to $.725$), led by servant leadership ($r = .725$), democratic leadership ($r = .723$), and transactional leadership ($r = .719$), with transformational leadership close behind ($r = .685$). Their associations with workplace productivity ($r = .485$ to $.556$) and service quality ($r = .509$ to $.564$), while significant and moderate-to-strong, were markedly lower. This pattern is theoretically coherent: satisfaction is the outcome most proximal to the supervisory relationship, registering directly how employees are treated, heard, and supported, whereas productivity and service quality are more distal outcomes shaped additionally by workload, systems, resources, and client circumstances. The primacy of servant leadership for satisfaction accords with Greenleaf's premise that prioritizing follower well-being yields contented, supported employees, and with evidence that

servant leadership combined with a supportive culture raises service outcomes in local government (Saadah & Agustiyara, 2024). The strong showing of transactional leadership on satisfaction is noteworthy for a welfare bureaucracy: clear responsibilities, monitored performance, and predictable standards evidently function as satisfiers rather than mere controls in civil service contexts (AlAbri et al., 2022; Aniebonam, 2023; Hutama et al., 2024).

Across the two performance outcomes, democratic leadership was consistently the strongest style, correlating at $r = .556$ with workplace productivity and $r = .564$ with service quality, while transformational leadership was comparatively weakest for productivity ($r = .485$). The consistency of democratic leadership's advantage suggests that in an agency whose programs demand consultation, cross-functional coordination, and community engagement, participatory supervision is the style most closely aligned with getting work done and serving clients well, echoing findings that participatory leadership improves productivity when paired with human capital development and knowledge sharing (Costa et al., 2023).

Relationships of the Engagement Dimensions with the Effectiveness Outcomes

The engagement dimensions displayed a higher and more uniform correlational profile across the outcomes than the leadership styles. Commitment to organizational goals produced the single strongest coefficient in the study with job satisfaction ($r = .758$), consistent with Social Exchange Theory's account of a reciprocal bond in which employees who feel invested in their organization also report the greatest contentment in it (Cropanzano et al., 2017; Saks, 2019; Akingbola et al., 2022). Dedication, meanwhile, was the strongest correlate of both workplace productivity ($r = .701$) and service quality ($r = .726$), the two highest coefficients recorded for any variable against the performance outcomes. In a social welfare agency, this is a substantively meaningful result: the sense of significance, pride, and purpose employees attach to their work is the human factor most strongly associated with output and client-facing quality, corroborating evidence that the dedication component of engagement is strongly associated with performance in public-serving institutions (Varshney & Goel, 2025; Deepalakshmi et al., 2024). Vigor held moderate-to-strong associations with all three outcomes ($r = .616$ to $.685$), while absorption, though the comparatively weakest dimension ($r = .551$ to $.585$), remained significant and practically meaningful.

Considered jointly, the two sets of results yield the study's central relational finding: leadership relates most strongly to how employees experience their work, while engagement, and dedication in particular, relates most strongly to what employees produce and deliver. Engagement's correlations with productivity ($r = .585$ to $.701$) and service quality ($r = .551$ to $.726$) uniformly exceed or match the leadership styles' corresponding ranges, positioning engagement as the broader-spectrum correlate of organizational effectiveness. This pattern challenges research traditions that treat engagement merely as a downstream consequence of leadership and supports its examination as a direct correlate of organizational outcomes in its own right (Saks, 2019; Bakker et al., 2023). At the same time, the strong showing of both blocks against all outcomes hints that leadership and engagement may operate in tandem rather than in competition, a possibility that correlational analysis cannot adjudicate and that the companion papers examine through multiple regression and structural equation modeling.

The Findings in International Perspective

Situating these coefficients internationally sharpens the study's contribution. The strong engagement-outcome associations observed here are consistent in direction with, and generally larger in magnitude than, the pooled effects reported in meta-analytic research linking work engagement to performance outcomes across predominantly Western samples (Mazzetti et al., 2021) and connecting engagement to satisfaction, productivity, and service outcomes across hundreds of business units worldwide (Harter et al., 2020). The leadership findings likewise parallel meta-analytic evidence that leadership styles overlap heavily and relate positively to public-sector outcomes (Backhaus & Vogel, 2022; Fischer & Sitkin, 2023), while reviews of engagement scholarship note that most evidence originates in corporate and developed-economy settings, leaving developing-country public bureaucracies under-represented (Kumar et al., 2023; Irianti et al., 2024). Against that backdrop, the present study contributes a rare sub-variable-level correlational map from a developing-country welfare bureaucracy characterized by a young, largely non-regular, mission-driven workforce, conditions under which

the primacy of dedication and commitment over even well-regarded leadership styles is an empirically distinctive, contextually grounded finding rather than a replication of Western patterns.

Position of These Findings within the Larger Research Program

The correlational results reported here perform a specific and foundational function within the research program from which this article is drawn, and the companion analyses complete what correlation begins. Because all twenty-four pairings are significant and the four leadership styles are themselves strongly inter-correlated, bivariate analysis alone cannot determine which variables carry unique predictive weight; the companion regression paper addresses precisely this by entering all sub-variables simultaneously, finding that only a subset of the correlated variables retains significant unique influence on organizational effectiveness. Similarly, correlation cannot adjudicate the architecture connecting the constructs, whether leadership and engagement operate independently, sequentially through mediation, or as correlated joint drivers; the companion structural equation modeling paper tests these competing configurations directly, using latent constructs whose indicators are the very sub-variables mapped here. The correlation matrix in Table 4 thus supplies the empirical motivation and the measurement groundwork for both advanced analyses: it establishes that relationships exist and are patterned, while the regression establishes which relationships are unique and the structural model establishes how the drivers are configured. Read together, the three analyses form a deliberate analytical progression from covariation to unique prediction to structure.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations, acknowledged in the design of the originating study, bound the interpretation of these findings. First, the cross-sectional correlational design establishes covariation at a single point in time and cannot support causal inference; whether leadership and engagement produce effectiveness, effectiveness enables engagement, or the relationships are reciprocal cannot be determined from these data. Second, all variables were measured through self-reported questionnaires, introducing the possibility of common method variance and social desirability effects; these risks were mitigated, though not eliminated, by the use of validated adapted instruments with strong internal consistency, assured anonymity and confidentiality, and aggregate-only reporting. Third, the study was conducted within a single regional office of the Department of Social Welfare and Development during a specific period, so the findings may not generalize readily to other regional offices, national agencies, private organizations, or other timeframes, and the distinctive workforce profile of DSWD-10, predominantly young and largely non-regular, may condition the observed relationships. Fourth, the study examined four leadership styles and four engagement dimensions; other leadership approaches, such as laissez-faire or situational leadership, and external factors influencing engagement were outside its scope. These limitations chart the path for the future research recommended below.

CONCLUSIONS

Three conclusions follow from the findings. First, leadership styles and employee engagement are significantly and positively related to all three dimensions of organizational effectiveness in DSWD-10, with no exception across twenty-four tested pairings; the null hypothesis is rejected in full. Second, the relationships are patterned rather than uniform: leadership styles, particularly servant and democratic leadership, associate most strongly with job satisfaction, whereas engagement dimensions, particularly dedication and commitment, associate most strongly with workplace productivity, service quality, and satisfaction respectively, indicating that different levers align with different outcomes. Third, employee engagement exhibits the broadest and steadiest associations with organizational effectiveness overall, indicating that a mission-driven, dedicated, and committed workforce is the human condition most closely associated with institutional performance in public welfare service. As correlational findings, these results establish covariation, not causation, and identify the relational structure that predictive and structural analyses must explain.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings, the following recommendations are advanced in the order of the empirical strength of the relationships on which they rest. Given that commitment to organizational goals and dedication exhibited

the strongest associations with the organizational effectiveness outcomes, DSWD-10 and similar public welfare institutions may prioritize engagement-deepening initiatives, including meaningful work design, sustained communication of the agency's social mission, and recognition systems inclusive of non-regular personnel, as a primary organizational strategy. Consistent with the strong associations of servant and democratic leadership with job satisfaction, and of democratic leadership with workplace productivity and service quality, supervisory development programs may strengthen participatory and stewardship competencies while preserving the clarity of expectations characteristic of transactional practice, which likewise related strongly to satisfaction in this civil service context. Human resource units may further differentiate interventions by target outcome, aligning satisfaction-oriented initiatives with the quality of supervisory relationships and performance-oriented initiatives with engagement development, while continuing to monitor vigor and absorption, whose moderate-to-strong associations merit sustained attention.

With respect to future research, longitudinal designs are recommended to trace how these relationships unfold over time and to address the causal limitations inherent in cross-sectional correlation. Mixed-method approaches may illuminate the mechanisms underlying the observed quantitative patterns, and the incorporation of objective performance indicators, such as program accomplishment rates, audit findings, and client feedback records, alongside perceptual measures would strengthen the robustness of subsequent investigations. Researchers are likewise encouraged to examine which of the correlated variables uniquely predict organizational effectiveness and which structural configuration best represents their joint influence, questions addressed in the companion papers of this research program, and to replicate the analysis in other field offices and government agencies to establish the generalizability of the findings.

REFERENCES

1. Akingbola, K., Rogers, S. E., & Intindola, M. (2022). Creating and sustaining employee engagement through human resource management. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08469-0_4
2. AlAbri, I., Siron, R. bte, Alzamel, S., Al-Enezi, H., & Cheok, M. Y. (2022). Assessing the employees' efficiency and adaptive performance for sustainable human resource management practices and transactional leadership: HR-centric policies for post COVID-19 era. *Frontiers in Energy Research*, 10, 959035. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2022.959035>
3. Aniebonam, E. E. (2023). Transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles: Systematic review of literature. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8410953>
4. Backhaus, L., & Vogel, R. (2022). Leadership in the public sector: A meta-analysis of styles, outcomes, contexts, and methods. *Public Administration Review*, 82(6), 986-1003. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13516>
5. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job demands-resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 25-53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933>
6. Costa, J., Pádua, M., & Moreira, A. C. (2023). Leadership styles and innovation management: What is the role of human capital? *Administrative Sciences*, 13(2), 47. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13020047>
7. Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 479-516. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099>
8. Deepalakshmi, N., Tiwari, D., Baruah, R., Seth, A., & Bisht, R. (2024). Employee engagement and organizational performance: A human resource perspective. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 5941-5948. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i4.2323>
9. Fischer, T., & Sitkin, S. B. (2023). Leadership styles: A comprehensive assessment and way forward. *Academy of Management Annals*, 17(1), 331-372. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0340>
10. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., Blue, A., Plowman, S. K., Josh, P., & Asplund, J. (2020). The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes: 2020 Q12 meta-analysis (10th ed.). Gallup. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/321725/gallup-q12-meta-analysis-report.aspx>
11. Irianti, I., Syarifuddin, S., & Haerani, A. (2024). Leadership styles and organizational effectiveness: A review of recent literature. *Advances Jurnal Ekonomi & Bisnis*, 2(4), 201. <https://doi.org/10.60079/ajeb.v2i4.316>

12. Kumar, M., Verma, M., & Ray, B. (2023). Unlocking the power of engagement: A comprehensive review and future research roadmap. *Acta Universitatis Bohemiae Meridionalis*, 26(3), 33. <https://doi.org/10.32725/acta.2023.015>
13. Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Guglielmi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Work engagement: A meta-analysis using the job demands-resources model. *Psychological Reports*, 126(3), 1069-1107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211051988>
14. Garzón-Lasso, F., Serrano-Malebrán, J., Arenas-Arango, S., & Molina, C. (2024). Full range leadership style and its effect on effectiveness, employee satisfaction, and extra effort: An empirical study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1380935. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1380935>
15. Grobler, A., & Flotman, A.-P. (2020). The validation of the servant leadership scale. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 46(0), a1754. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v46i0.1754>
16. Hutama, A. A., Noermijati, N., & Irawanto, D. W. (2024). The effect of transactional leadership on employee performance mediated by job satisfaction, job stress and trust. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 13(3), 151-166. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v13i3.3297>
17. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2014). Construct validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 56(3), 331-337. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000113>
18. Pažur, M. (2020). Development and validation of a research instrument for measuring the presence of democratic school leadership characteristics. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220937312>
19. Saadah, M., & Agustiyara, A. (2024). Transformational leadership and dynamic managerial capabilities in public sector innovation. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 16(1), 201. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.16.2024.201-214>
20. Saks, A. M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 6(1), 19-38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-06-2018-0034>
21. Schaufeli, W. B., Shimazu, A., Hakanen, J., Salanova, M., & De Witte, H. (2019). An ultra-short measure for work engagement: The UWES-3 validation across five countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 35(4), 577-591. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000430>
22. Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology: How to choose a sampling technique for research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18-27. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205035>
23. Tang, H., An, S., Zhang, L., Xiao, Y., & Li, X. (2024). The antecedents and outcomes of public service motivation: A meta-analysis using the job demands-resources model. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(10), 861. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14100861>
24. van der Vaart, L., & Linde, B. (2021). The performance measurement conundrum: Construct validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire in South Africa. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 24(1), a3581. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v24i1.3581>
25. Varshney, D., & Goel, D. (2025). The impact of work engagement on job satisfaction among employees teaching in the university. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 6(6), 5036. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0625.2178>
26. Zahri, T. A., Lubis, A. R., Djalil, M. A., & Syafruddin, S. (2023). Analysis of service quality factors of the Regional Planning Agency of Aceh. *Emerging Science Journal*, 7(5), 1723. <https://doi.org/10.28991/esj-2023-07-05-017>