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Health care organizations strive continuously to improve their performance in order to be survived and gain competitive advantage. In pursuit of better organizational performance, in most of the health care industry the employees’ job performance and are deemed quite significant. There are many factors that influence on employees’ job performance. The aim of the current study is to find out impact of leadership styles on employees’ job performance mediating role of organization culture. Analytical cross-sectional study was conducted among 296 health care professionals in tertiary public sector hospital, Karachi. Probability random sampling technique was used to collect data. Duration of the study was 4months. Data were collected via self-administered questionnaire. A questionnaire includes Demographic Variables and items of each construct. SPSS software version 23 was used to assess Mean and SD, frequency and % for quantitative and qualitative variables, respectively. Data were screened to assess normality. Reliability has been assessed through Cronbach’s alpha. Pearson correlation, hierarchical multiple regressions and bootstrapping procedure through macro process were used to find out relationship, significant and mediating effect respectively. P-value < 0.05 consider significant for this study. The response rate was 86% (n=255). 60.8 % (n=115) respondents were female, 80.4% (n = 205) were full time employees. 41. 60 % (n= 106) health care professional
were doctors. Mean years of working experience and Age were 3.07 ±0.98 and 2.58±1.02 respectively. Findings of the Pearson Correlation are statistically significant. The hierarchical multiple regressions revealed leadership styles and organization culture together explained significant number of variances on job performance \([R^2 = 0.897; \text{P-Value} = 0.000]\) and Organization \([R^2 = 0.279; \text{P-Value} = 0.000]\). The bootstrapped indirect effect of transformational leadership style on job performance and organization are statistically significant and \(\beta= 0.095\) and \(\beta= 0.041\), respectively. Organization culture is fully mediating the relationship between transformational leadership style and job performance. In this study all hypothesis were proved and statistically significant.
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**Introduction**

Maintaining good standards and quality performance enables organizations survive and advance in the business world. All progress and innovation in organizations are outcome of employees who are considered the basic asset and capital for their organizations and enable their organizations work on and achieve organizational objectives and aims. (Asgharpoor, 2007). Different aspects relating to job place impact on organizational performance. These aspects include levels and quality of education, leadership styles, beliefs, organizational, values and culture, and job performance (Shahhosseini et al, 2016). Of these, in pursuit of better organizational performance, in most of the organizations the employees’ job performance and are deemed quite significant (Shahpoor, 2011). Keeping these observations in view it appears to take into enhance the quality of organizational performance by focusing on the aspects that influence employees’ job performance. This is necessary because low standard performance of job is likely to cause an increase in the costs, and lower the employee’s competence and efficiency, cause want of financial resources and also reduce job opportunities and incentives (Nekooi Moghaddam et al, 2012).

**Literature Review**

**Job Performance**

The existing literature demonstrates various perspectives of job performance. Academic studies define the notion of job performance as the collective behavior of an individual towards his job (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994), The resultant product or outcome that stem from the service offered by any individual during the job (Swanson et al., 1998), The endeavor of a person in attaining the organizational goals (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993),
net return in services and production, gained by an organization through the striving efforts of the employee (Spector, 2006). The success of person is measured through the tools of achievements made in his/her work (Millar & Stevens, 2012). Being the multi-faceted notion, the magnitudes of job performance are task performance and contextual performance (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Further, the task performance denotes the capabilities of an employee to execute operational activities in contribution, directly or indirectly, to the technical core of the organization. The inputs from the production workers are referred as direct contribution. On the other hand, the indirect contribution pertains to the role of managerial staff. Moreover, the contextual performance relates to supportive activities in developing conducive environment for attaining the goals of the organizations. It incorporates the helping behavior of an employee towards others in carrying out activities. Furthermore, it reflects the behavior of an individual to suggest improvement in operational activities.

According to Borman and Motowidlo (1997), Motowidlo and Schmit (1999), there are three elementary suppositions connected to comparison of task and contextual performance. These are: (1) The activities involved in task performance vary across jobs while the activities of contextual performance remain analogous between jobs; (2) Task performance reflects the capability to perform job however contextual performance depicts the personality traits and motivation level of an individual employee; (3) Task performance reveals the in-built and agreed upon behavior whereas contextual performance is considered to be more flexible and additional role of an employee. In this study Borman and Motowidlo’s Task and Contextual Performance model has been considered to assesses health care professionals job performance.

**Leadership Style**

Leadership defines as a process in which people out of their willingness and choice opt to seek guidance and direction from a leader (Bess et al., 2003). A leader is one who influences others to follow him/her in pursuit of specific aims and goals. Bass (1985) categorizes leadership styles as transformational, transactional and laissez-faire in his full Range Leadership model. This theory falling within the scope of behavioral theory of leadership which includes three types of transformation behavior (Idealized influence, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration) and two types of transactional behavior (Contingent reward & Passive management by exception). An inspirational motivation and active management by exception aspect of transformational and transactional leadership styles respectively are addition to behavioral theory of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The idealized influence and inspirational motivation are associated to charisma of a leader i.e. the charismatic style of leadership, and this idealized influence behavior brings forth another product the idealized influence attributions (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Bass full range Leadership theory over the time have been evolved into nine factor model which includes; idealized influence behavior and attributes, inspirational motivation, individualized
consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, active and passive management by exception and laissez-fair.( Bass et al., 2003).

**Transformational Leadership**

One the style of leadership is transformational leadership wherein charisma of the leader is the key to influence through personality, intellect or other features. Transformational leadership style comprises of four components.

*Idealized Influence:* Bass (1985) & Gill (2006) describe idealized influence when a leader is followed as a role model. These types of leaders are well conversant with the need of their followers which these leaders prefer over their own needs (Bess et al., 2003). This attribute of the leader serves as a source of and loyalty for the leader’s vision.

*Inspirational Motivation:* Another feature ‘inspirational motivation’ is outcome of the act of leaders whereby they trigger enthusiasm among their followers for teamwork. The leader also places his trust in his followers with regard to accomplishing their team tasks (Yulk & Van Fleet, 1982). Besides, these kinds of leaders motivate their followers to be industrious in performance of their work so as to attain goals of the organization. This happens when the leader presents the organization’s vision clearly to the followers (Hoyt et al., 2006). Such leaders exploit the tendencies of their followers toward attaining objectives through clarifying the challenges as the achievable targets (Baa et al., 2003).

**Transactional Leadership**

Another style of leadership is the transactional style which consist of contingent reward and active and passive management by exception.

*Contingent Reward:* In this style, followers are motivated by promising incentives and rewards depending on their output (Bass & Avolio, 2004). These rewards are termed as contingent rewards referring to a transaction between employees and their leader. Like any other negotiation, the leader and the followers may conduct negotiation about task performance & outcomes and the reward compensation. For this purpose, leaders set and assign specific goals and task to their subordinates (Bass et al., 2003). Since these goals and tasks are set by the leaders, this style of leadership is considered as directive style. It’s not the rewards alone for performance, but in case the promised tasks are not performed as per demand of the leader and as promised by the subordinates, the leader may criticize the performance or even award punishment as per already agreed negotiations in this regard (Gill, 2006).
Laissez-Faire Leadership

In another style of leadership, the ‘Laissez-faire’ style, a leader is not actively engaged in the leading process (Yulk, 2010). In other words a leader avoids leading directly, and avoiding any interference, lets some selected subordinates to take charge of the employee management (Gill, 2006). These types of leaders lack the ability of decision-making and properly leading their followers. Hence their role is passive in nature where they avoid interaction with the subordinate employees (Sadler, 2003). This also keeps the employees far from individual and group development. Issues of followers remain neglected (Yulk, 2010) referring also that from leaders side, there is no contribution in employees development (Northhouse, 2007).

On the bases of Full Range theory of Leadership, The Multiple Leadership Questionnaire was introduced by Bass in 1985 to examine the different leadership styles including transformational style, transactional style and Laissez-faire style (Bass and Avolio, 2004). This questionnaire comprises different behavioral components for transformational style of leadership as follows: (a) Idealized influence behavior, (b) idealized influence attribution, (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, and (e) individualized consideration. In comparison to the transformational style of leadership, the transactional leadership comprises three behavioral components: (a) contingent reward; (b) active management by exception; and (c) passive management by exception and last on is laissez-Faire leadership style also refer as Passive-Avoidant style.

Mediating Effect of Organization Culture on the Relationship B/W Leadership Style and Job Performance

The relationship between culture and leadership has been theoretically researched by a number of scholars and researchers, however, need is felt that research focuses also on finding out the empirical link between culture and leadership and impact of this connection on the performance of an organization (Hickman and Silva, 1984; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985; Sergiovanni and Corbally, 1984; Smith and Peterson, 1988; Tichy and Cohen, 1997; Trice and Beyer, 1993). Research studies reveal that employees’ performance improves when there is a fair harmony between organizational culture and leadership styles (Harris and Ogbonna, 2001; Hickman and Silva, 1984; Lim, 1995). Appelbaum et al. (2004) and Yousef (2000) claim that job satisfaction and leadership behaviors were considered significant during the past decades, and diversified conclusions were established about the relationship between the two factors (Pool, 1997; Savery, 1994; Yousef, 2000). It may be therefore difficult to associate any particular style of leadership to employee satisfaction. There are some other researchers who propose adopting a leadership style conducive to the culture and the environment because, according to them, the level of employee dissatisfaction is likely to decline this way. Yousef (2000) relates that several studies have been conducted
on the affiliation between leadership behavior and the level of work performance, however, the findings were not the same. Downey et al. (1975) and Kahai et al. (1997) observe on the basis of some studies about some industries that highly structured tasks in combination with a directive style of leadership resulted in higher levels of job performance and employee satisfaction whereas supportive style of leadership was found effective in the case of unstructured tasks. Yousef (2000) relates that findings of the previous research works on employee were partially consistent. Blau (1985) and Williams and Hazer (1986) notice that employee was less influenced by task structure than the style of leadership. Kim (2002) claims there is more job satisfaction where leaders exercise participative style.

Deal and Kennedy (1982), Lok & Crawford (2001) and Peters & Waterman (1982) argue that higher levels of employee and performance rely also on organizational culture. In the states and societies where cultures have tendencies of change and support, the industrial and corporate sectors employees in those states were more satisfied and committed while the countries exercising bureaucratic orientations possessed rather dissatisfied employee with lower levels of (Brewer, 1993; Brewer, 1994; Brewer and Clippard, 2002; Kratrina, 1990; Krausz et al., 1995; Lok and Crawford, 2001; London and Larsen, 1999; Rashid et al., 2003; Silverthorne, 2004; Trice and Beyer, 1993; Wallach, 1983). Employees without satisfaction at workplace lack, and are likely to seek employment elsewhere whenever they found an opportunity. Where they get no such chance, they perform work without passion and devotion.

In summary, there have been various researches that explore the relationship between leadership styles, organization culture, Job performance. On the basis of Previous Studies findings conducted both in western and non-western countries. It is reasonable to project that types of leadership have significant influence on job performance. Researcher also reported that these relationship or influence affected by organization culture (Li, 2004; Chen, 2007, Jernigan et al. 2002; & Samad, 2005)
Conceptual Framework

From the existing literature, however, the various magnitudes of leadership styles can be explored that has a significant impact on the attributes of an employee like satisfaction, performance and his/her role in team work. Leadership with transformational style has a strong and significant linkage with the outcomes of the organization (Bass, 1985) due to its association with the behaviors of the employees (Camps & Rodriguez, 2011; Chen, 2004; Erkutlu, 2008; Limsila&Ogunlana, 2008; Lo et al., 2010; McGuire &Kennerly, 2006). Ozaralli (2003) explored that the effectiveness of the team and empowerment of the employees is enhanced through the style of leadership. The style of leadership has a significant and positive impact on the organizational which results in positive impact on the work performance and satisfaction of the employee (Chung-Hsiung et al., 2013). On the basis of extensive literature review; in this study, following hypothesis proposed

H1: There is a significant relationship between leadership styles and Job Performance
Studies finding revealed significant relationship and impact of leadership styles on organizational outcomes and culture in health care sector. Deal and Kennedy (1982), Lok & Crawford (2001) and Peters & Waterman (1982) argue that higher levels of employee and performance rely also on organizational culture. In the states and societies where cultures have tendencies of change and support, the industrial and corporate sectors employees in those states were more satisfied and committed while the countries exercising bureaucratic orientations possessed rather dissatisfied employee with lower levels of (Brewer, 1993; Brewer, 1994; Brewer and Clippard, 2002; Kratrina, 1990; Krausz et al., 1995; Lok and Crawford, 2001; London and Larsen, 1999; Rashid et al., 2003; Silverthorne, 2004; Trice and Beyer, 1993; Wallach, 1983). Zehir, Ertosun&Muceldili (2011) revealed the significant and direct positive association of leadership style with organizational culture in a study conducted on multinational companies in Turkey. According to Darvish et al., (2014), there exists a strong and positive correlation between performance and culture of the organization. The importance of organizational culture regarding organizational performance and are observed in the study conducted by Lee & Yu (2004) and the results of the research work were further validated in the research work of Nazarian, Atkinson &Froodi (2017). Therefore, the researchers emphasize in development of organizational culture for better performance of the organization. Organizations normally face the problem of employee’s low performance. Organizational culture is the force that helps to conclude the performance and effectiveness of the operational activities (Denison, 1990).

**H2:** Organization Culture mediate the relationship between leadership style and employees Job Performance

**Research Methodology**

Analytical cross-sectional study design used to conduct study among health care professionals in tertiary public sector hospital to find out the effect of leadership styles on employees’ job performance and organizational and mediating role of organizational culture in health care industry. Each construct was assessed via using pre-designed scale with reported strong reliability and validity. Statistical tools were used to find relationship b/w Independent, dependent, and mediating variable and also assess significant impact via hierarchical multiple regressions and bootstrapping procedure through macro process on SPSS. The detail of methodology implemented in this study is as follow:

**Research Design**

Observational Analytical cross-sectional study was conducted to assess the effect of leadership styles on employee’s job performance and organizational and mediating role of
organizational culture in the relationship between leadership styles and employee’s job performance.

**Targeted Population and Sample**

The targeted population of this study was health care professionals and sample were selected from health care professionals, working at tertiary care public sector hospital, Karachi.

**Sample Size**

In this study sample size calculated via using formula proposed by Daniel (1999) for cross sectional study in health care sector:

\[
n = \frac{z^2 \cdot p \cdot (1-p)}{d^2}
\]

Where
- \( Z = 1.96 \) at 95% confidence interval
- \( p = 0.74 \) (Lin, MacLennan, Hunt, & Cox, 2015)
- \( d = 0.05 \) precision

Calculated sample size = 296

**Sampling Technique**

Probability random sampling technique was used in this study.

**Sample Selection: Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria**

- Health care professionals, working in Tertiary care, public sector hospital.
- Both gender who worked as a Full time and Contractual employees.
- Lower age limit is 27 Years old.
- Participant willing to participate in study

**Exclusion Criteria**

- Health care professionals working in private sector hospital
- Health care professionals who are doing additional responsibility as a faculty in medical university.
- Age below 27 Years

**Methodology for Collecting the Data**

Data were collected via self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaires were filled by the health care professionals includes; Doctor, Nurses, Physiotherapist, Respiratory therapist and
others, working under the supervisor and leaders at the tertiary care public sector hospital in Karachi. Nurses These health care providers have major contribution in health care industry, they responded with a keen interest when they were briefed about research.

**Measurement of Variables**

Self administered Questionnaires were used in this study which comprises of five sections. Section one includes Demographic Variables, Section two consist 21- items of Multifactor leadership questionnaire, comprises of Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-fair leadership style. Section Three includes 12 items of organization culture scale; Section Four includes 09 items of Job performance scale. Section five includes 8-items of organization scale.

**Study Variables**

**Independent Variables:** includes Leadership Styles (Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-fair Style)

**Mediating Variable:** Organization culture

**Dependent variable:** Job Performance & Organization

**Scale Developments**

The detail of each section/construct of questionnaire is as follows:

**Demographic Variables:** Includes; Gender, Age, Qualification, Employment status, Current organization professional experience and Professional Status. (Appendix: A)

**Leadership Style:** In this study, items from reliable and valid Multifactor leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-6S) originality proposed by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio (1995) were used to assess the transformational, transactional and laissez-fair leadership style. This scale measure 7 factors that determine transformational, transactional and laissez-fair leadership style

**Organization Culture:** Comet (Contexte Organisationnel et Managerial en Etablissemnet de Sante) English translated, multi dimension organization culture scale, specifically designed for health care organization culture, were used in this study. As per study requirement, 12 items extracted from the four dimensions out of six reported in Comet questionnaire which includes; Department management, relation and communication in the department, relation with the patient & his/her family and Support from the department head. Participants were reported their responses on Five point rating scale ranging from 1-Strongly Disagree to 5 Strongly Agree. Prior research reported strong psychometric properties (Validity and Reliability) and Cronbach alpha is 0.93 (Saillour-Glénisson et al.,2016) (Appendix: C)
**Job Performance:** Goodman & Svyantek’s 1999 job performance scale has been used to assess employees’ job performance. Scale consist of two dimension including, Contextual performance and task performance. In this study, job performance assess via task performance 9 items scale. Participants were reported their responses on five point likert scale ranging from 1 represented strongly disagree to 5 represented strongly Agree. Goodman & Svyantek (1999) report internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) of 0.90 and 0.88 for task performance and contextual performance respectively. (Appendix: D)

**Research Techniques**

Data was analyzed using SPSS version 23 software. MS- Excel and MS- word were used to plot graph/charts and tables respectively. Mean ± SD and percentage and frequency were used to explore qualitative and quantitative variables respectively. Estimates of skewness and kurtosis were used to assess Normality. Cronbach’s alpha was used to find reliability of each Construct. Pearson correlation was used to find out the relationship b/w independent (Leadership Styles includes; Transformational, Transactional and Laissez fair Style) , Mediating (Organization culture) and dependent variable (Job Performance & Organization ). Hierarchical Multiple Regressions were used to assess variances explained by predictor variables and macro process bootstrapping procedure used to assess mediating variables. P-value < 0.05 consider significant for this study.

Prior to hypothesis testing, normality of data has been assessed via estimates of skewness and kurtosis. The value of skewness and kurtosis for each construct and sub-constructs includes; Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Idealized influence, Inspirational motivation, Individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, Contingent Reward, Management by exception, Organization culture, job performance and employees’ were within ±1, which depict data were normally distributed.

**Reliability**

Cronbach’s alpha for each construct and sub constructs such as Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Idealized influence, Inspirational motivation, Individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, Contingent Reward, Management by exception, Organization culture, job performance and employees’ reported above 0.70, which revealed strong reliability. Alpha value for Transformational, Transactional and Laissez fair leadership styles are $\alpha = 0.71, 0.71, 0.77$ respectively. Cronbach’s alpha for sub-constructs such as Idealized influence ($\alpha = 0.82$), Inspirational motivation ($\alpha = 0.81$), Intellectual stimulation ($\alpha = 0.79$), Individual consideration ($\alpha = 0.83$), Contingent Reward ($\alpha = 0.85$), Management by exception ($\alpha = 0.77$) reported above 0.70. Internal consistency reliability of
Organization culture, Job performance and employees’ organizational are $\alpha = 0.74$, 0.73, 0.73 respectively

**Descriptive Statistic**

A total of $n=296$ health care professionals were targeted in this study. The response rate was 86%. Out of 296, 255 dully filled questionnaires were received. Demographic characteristics of health care professionals, working at tertiary care, public sector hospital were shown in Table 1 and Figure 1 to 4.

**Pearson Correlation**

Findings of the Pearson Correlation are shown statistically significant correlation b/w most of the construct at P-Value 0.01 & 0.05 as present in Table # 02. Idealized influence revealed significant positive relationship with Inspirational Motivation ($r = 0.78$), Intellectual stimulation ($r = 0.96$), Management by exception ($r = 0.16$), Transformational Leadership ($r = 0.92$), Organization Culture ($r = 0.20$), Job performance ($r = 0.20$) and Organizational ($r = 0.22$.) and significant negative relationship with Laissez-Fair Leadership ($r = 0.18$). Inspirational motivation also revealed statistically significant positive relationship with Intellectual Stimulation ($r = 0.78$), Transformational leadership ($r = 0.82$) and Organizational ($r = 0.20$). Intellectual Stimulation correlated significantly with Management by exception ($r = 0.20$), Transformational leadership ($r = 0.89$), Transactional Leadership ($r = 0.13$), Laissez-Fair leadership ($r = -0.18$), Organization Culture ($r = 0.16$), Job performance ($r = 0.16$) and Organizational ($r = 0.24$). Individual consideration shown significant positive relationship with Transformational leadership ($r = 0.22$) and Organizational ($r = 0.17$). Contingent reward significantly correlated with Management by Exception ($r = 0.57$), Transactional Leadership ($r = 0.93$) and Laissez-Fair leadership ($r = 0.15$). Transformational Leadership depict statistically significant correlation with Laissez-Fair leadership ($r = -0.22$), Organization Culture ($r = 0.17$), Job Performance ($r = 0.17$) and Organizational ($r = 0.27$). Organization culture shown statistically significant relationship with Job Performance ($r = 0.95$) and Organizational ($r = 0.45$). Job Performance also correlate significantly with organizational ($r = 0.53$).

**Hierarchical Multiple Regressions**

The hierarchical multiple regressions have been done to find out amount of variances reported in job performance and organization by independent variables. Hierarchical multiple regression was conducted in 02 stages. Leadership styles was entered at stage one and Organization culture entered in stage two of the multiple regression.
Macro Process Bootstrap to test Mediator

The analysis just explored the impact of leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-fair) on job performance. The next hypotheses propose to test indirect (i.e. mediated) effect through organization culture. Organization culture tested as a possible mediator of the relationship between leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-fair) and job performance and organizational respectively. (Figure I: Conceptual model). Mediator were assessed by calculating bias corrected 95% CI via bootstrapping with 10,000 resample’s through macro process procedure on SPSS. As suggested by Mackinnon and colleagues, mediation analysis conducted when there is a relationship between predictor and mediator and mediator and outcome. (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002) In this study Following criteria considered to established mediator effect, first: the strength of the direct relationship between predictor and outcome (path c) will be diminished and non significant when mediator entered into the analysis (path c’). (Figure II: Tested Model). Second; Zero is not in the range of 95 % confidence interval (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). The bootstrapped indirect effect of transformational, transactional and laissez-Fair Leadership styles on job performance are 0.095 CI [0.027-0.159], - 0.059 CI [-0.176-0.062] & 0.20 CI [-0.162-0.557]. The indirect effect of transformational, transactional and laissez-Fair Leadership styles on Organizational are 0.041 CI [0.012-0.074], - 0.027 CI [-0.089-0.029] and 0.093 CI [-0.072-0.259].

Discussion

86% (n= 255/296) duly filled Questionnaires were received. 60.8 % (n=115) respondents were female, 80.4% (n = 205) were full time employees. 47.8 % (n=122) reported master degree as their level of education. 41. 60 % (n= 106 ) health care professional were doctors, 32.90% (n=84  ) respondents were belong to age group range between 41-47years old and 44% (n =112 ) respondents have more than 10year experience in the current organization as shown in table # 01 and Figure 01,02 and 03. Mean years of current organization working experience was 3.07 ±0.98. Mean age of respondents was 2.58±1.02.

Table 1: Demographic profile of the Respondents (n=255)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Status</th>
<th>PHD</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Therapist</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technologist</td>
<td>14.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>41.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment Status:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Professional Status
Findings of the Pearson Correlation are shown statistically significant correlation b/w Idealized influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual stimulation, Management by
exception, Individual consideration, Transformational Leadership, Organization Culture, Job performance.
Table 02: Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach’s Alphas and Pearson Correlation of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>TL1</th>
<th>TL2</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>O.Comt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL1</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL2</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>39.71</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.Comt</td>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
II, Idealized Influence; IM, Inspirational Motivation; IS, Intellectual Stimulation; IC, Individual Consideration, CR, Contingent Reward; ME, Management by Exception, TL1, Transformational Leadership; TL2, Transactional Leadership; LF, Laissez-Fair Leadership; OC, Organization Culture; JP, Job Performance; O. Comt. Organizational
The hierarchical multiple regressions revealed that transformational leadership, transactional leadership, Laissez-Fair leadership and organization culture together explained significant amount of variances on job performance \[ R^2 = 0.897; \text{ P- Value} = 0.000 \] and Organization \[ R^2 = 0.279; \text{ P- Value} = 0.000 \]. 89.7% variances in job performance and 27.7% variances in organization reported due to predictor variables.

Leadership styles contributed significantly to the regression model \[ F (3, 251) = 3.549, \text{ P-Value} = 0.015 \] when entered in first stage and explained 4.1% variance in job performance. Introducing organization culture in the second stage also revealed significant contribution \[ F (4, 250) = 547.16, \text{ P-Value} = 0.000 \] and accounted an additional 85.6% variation in job performance and total variance explained by leadership styles and organization culture is 89.7% as shown in Table # 03.

### Table 03: Hierarchical multiple regression for Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Fair Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Fair Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ( R^2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hierarchical multiple regression also explained significant contribution of leadership styles on organization \[ F (3, 251) = 6.993, \text{ P-Value} = 0.000 \] and explained 7.7% variance. In stage two, organization culture, accounted an additional 20.2% variation in organizational and significant \( R^2 = 0.279 \) has been reported \[ F (4, 250) = 24.235, \text{ P-Value} = 0.000 \]. In the final model, Leadership styles and organization culture was the strong predictor of organization as shown in Table # 04.
Table 04: Hierarchical multiple regression for organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Fair Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Fair Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between transformational leadership style and job performance is mediated by organization culture. As illustrated in figure 05, 06 & 07; when organization culture entered as a mediator into the relationship; the direct effect of transformation leadership ($\beta =0.10$, $P< 0.01$) on job performance diminished to ($\beta=0.006$). The regression coefficient between transformational leadership and organizational culture is statistically significant ($\beta =0.12$, $P< 0.01$), as the regression coefficient between organization culture and job performance ($\beta =0.762$, $P< 0.01$). The bootstrapped indirect effect of transformational leadership style on job performance is $\beta=0.095$ and the 95% confidence interval ranged from 0.027-0.159. Thus, the indirect effect was statistically significant which means that Organization culture is fully mediating the relationship between transformational leadership style and job performance. Relationship between Transactional leadership style and job performance doesn’t mediated by organization culture as the regression coefficient of direct effect ($\beta=0.16$) is greater than total effect ($\beta=-0.043$) and zero is also in the range of 95 % Confidence interval. There is a mild effect of organization culture on the relationship between laissez fair leadership style and job performance. As shown in figure: there is a mild reduction in regression coefficient ($\beta=0.153$) when organization culture entered as a mediator ($\beta=0.047$).
**Figure 04.** Model to Test mediating effect

![Diagram showing the model to test mediating effect between Leadership Styles and Job Performance via Mediating Variable (Organization Culture).]

**Figure 05.** Mediating effect on relationship b/w Transformation Leadership & Job Performance

![Diagram showing the mediating effect on the relationship between Transformational Leadership and Job Performance through Organization Culture.]

Path a: Leadership Styles → Mediating Variable (Organization Culture)
Path b: Mediating Variable (Organization Culture) → Outcome Variables (Job Performance & Organizational)
Path c: Leadership Styles → Job Performance
Path c’: Transformational Leadership → Organization Culture
**Figure 06.** Mediating effect on relationship b/w Transactional Leadership & Job Performance

Indirect Effect: -0.059 CI [-0.176-0.062]

![Diagram of Figure 06](image)

**Figure 07.** Mediating effect on relationship b/w Laissez-Fair Leadership & Job Performance

Indirect Effect: 0.20 CI [-0.162-0.557]

![Diagram of Figure 07](image)
Discussion and Findings

The aim of the current study is to find out the impact of leadership styles on employees’ job performance and organization and mediating effect of organization culture in the relationship between leadership style and job performance. Job performance and organization are the key factors that have significant impact on organization productivity. This study focused to determine job performance and organization of health care professionals who are working in tertiary care public sector hospital. Past studies reported number of organization related factors have significant impact on employees’ job performance. This study focused on the effect of leadership style and organization culture on employees’ job performance. In the current study author hypothesize that:

**H1:** There is a significant relationship between leadership styles, Job Performance. Findings of the Pearson correlation revealed significant relationship between Idealized influence and Inspirational Motivation \((r = 0.78)\), Intellectual stimulation \((r = 0.96)\), Management by exception \((r = 0.16)\), Transformational Leadership \((r = 0.92)\), Organization Culture \((r = 0.20)\), Job performance \((r = 0.20)\) and relationship with Laissez-Fair Leadership \((r = 0.18)\). Inspirational motivation also revealed statistically significant positive relationship with Intellectual Stimulation \((r = 0.78)\), Transformational leadership \((r = 0.82)\) and Organizational \((r = 0.20)\). Intellectual Stimulation correlated significantly with Management by exception \((r = 0.20)\), Transformational leadership \((r = 0.89)\), Transactional Leadership \((r = 0.13)\), Laissez-Fair leadership \((r = -0.18)\), Organization Culture \((r = 0.16)\), Job performance \((r = 0.16)\) and Organizational \((r = 0.24)\). Individual consideration shown significant positive relationship with Transformational leadership \((r = 0.22)\) and Organizational \((r = 0.17)\). Contingent reward significantly correlated with Management by Exception \((r = 0.57)\), Transactional Leadership \((r = 0.93)\) and Laissez-Fair leadership \((r = 0.15)\). Transformational Leadership depict statistically significant correlation with Laissez-Fair leadership \((r = -0.22)\), Organization Culture \((r = 0.17)\), Job Performance \((r = 0.17)\) and Organizational \((r = 0.27)\). Organization culture shown statistically significant relationship with Job Performance \((r = 0.95)\) and Organizational \((r = 0.45)\). Job Performance also correlate significantly with organizational \((r = 0.53)\).

Past studies also supported current study findings. Analytical cross sectional study conducted among 201 registered nurses in Australia Transformational leadership significantly positively correlated with team climate \((r= 0.486, \text{P-Value} < 0.001)\), Perceived Quality of care \((r= 0.209, \text{P-Value} <0.01)\), Social Identity \((r=0.341, \text{P-Value}<0.01)\) (Cheng, Bartram, Karimi, & Leggat, 2016). Žibert & Stanc (2018) conducted cross sectional study among 112 health care providers targeted from four health care centers reported that Transformational and Transactional leadership style revealed significant positive relationship with the introduced
changes (r= 0.84 & r= 0.74 at P-Value <0.01 respectively), while laissez fair style revealed significant negative relationship (r=0.46 , p-Value <0.01).

**H2:** Organization Culture mediate the relationship between leadership style and Job Performance: organization culture along with leadership styles revealed significant contribution [F (4, 250) = 547.16, P-Value = 0.000] and accounted 89.7% variances on job performance. The relationship between transformational leadership style and job performance is mediated by organization culture. The bootstrapped indirect effect of transformational leadership style on job performance is β= 0.095 and the 95% confidence interval ranged from 0.027-0.159. Thus, the indirect effect was statistically significant which means that Organization culture is fully mediating the relationship between transformational leadership style and job performance. There is a mild effect of organization culture on the relationship between laissez fair leadership style and job performance. There is a mild reduction in regression coefficient (β= 0.153) when organization culture entered as a mediator (β= 0.047). Relationship between Transactional leadership style and job performance doesn’t mediated by organization culture. Number of past researches acknowledged current study findings.

Merrill (2015) conducted descriptive co-relational study among 466 staff nurses across 9 hospitals in Utah. Hospital Unit Safety climate survey & Multifactorial leadership Questionnaire were used. Findings of the study revealed significant relationship between leadership style and subscale of safety climate. Transformation leadership style (P-value= 0.001) depict positive while laissez faire (P-value= 0.01) shown negative relationship with safety climate. Transformational & laissez fair leadership style accounted 63.2% variances in manager support subscale. Number of studies reported significant impact of organization culture on job performance (Nazarian et al., 2017; Lee & Yu, 2004). Researcher also assessed role of organization culture in the relationship between leadership style and job performance and found significant impact on job performance (Zehir et al.,2011 and Darvish et al., 2014). Downey et al. (1975) and Kahai et al. (1997) observe on the basis of some studies about some industries that highly structured tasks in combination with a directive style of leadership resulted in higher levels of job performance and employee satisfaction whereas supportive style of leadership was found effective in the case of unstructured tasks.

**Theoretical and Practical Significance**

The current study findings are consistent with the findings of the studies conducted among health care professionals in developing and developed countries. This study depicts significant contribution in the existing body of knowledge, because it is the first study conducted among health care professionals in public sector tertiary care hospital Karachi to assess the role of leadership styles in the development of high quality culture and its impact.
on employees’ job performance. In line with the past researches author in this study also found job performance and organization are the major factors that play significant role in organization performance and productivity. There are numbers of factors that impact health care professionals’ job performance. Factors identified in this study were leadership styles and organization culture which have significant impact on job performance.

The policy maker need to design strategies to identify organization related factors that may impact on employees job performance and that have major impact on quality of services and organization productivity. The health care provides should foster working environment that must encourage engagement and accountability and provide accountable care. Leaders should become an exemplary leader in health care industry. Leaders should bring simple, practical strategies and tactics in his/her leadership style, which includes self awareness, Coaching and development, Innovation, Lean into discomfort, Alignment and synergy and health care provider engagement. Management must ensure resources are adequate to provide quality care patient care in chaotic public sector hospital.

**Limitation and Future Research Recommendation**

Findings of the study, however, add a new perspective in the existing knowledge. There is a certain limitations need to be mentioned. The first is that, Participants were selected from public sector tertiary care hospital, there by excluding health care professional who were working in secondary and primary care hospital as well as private sector. Need to conduct research to approach health care professionals who were providing services in private sector hospital. A second limitation is that, data were collected from employees working in tertiary care public sector hospital to rate their leaders leadership styles. There is a need to conduct study to target upper management or leaders to report their leadership styles so variance between leaders and followers reported by leaders as well as followers would be assessed. A third limitation is that, the Study design was cross sectional, data regarding leadership styles, organization culture, job performance and organizational were collected simultaneously, there is a need to conduct prospective study to observe systematically impact of leadership styles and organization culture on job performance.

**Conclusion**

In this study five major hypotheses were proposed to determine impact of leadership styles on employees’ job performance and also assessed mediating role of organization culture. First hypothesis proposed to test relationship between sub-constructs of leadership styles in addition to transformational, transactional and laissez fair leadership styles, organization culture, job performance. There is a significant relationship between most of the constructs and sub-construct at p-value < 0.05 and 0.05. Second and third hypothesis proposes to test
significant effect of leadership styles on employee’s job performance and organization; findings of the study revealed leadership styles have significant impact on employees’ job performance. Next hypothesis proposes to test mediating role of organization culture in the relationship between leadership styles and job performance as well as. Findings revealed that organization culture fully mediating the relationship between transformational leadership style and job performance.
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