

# The Influence of Leadership Styles on Team Performance in Public Transportation in Dubai, The,-UAE

Fatima Ahmed, Khalip Musa

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia

Email: Um\_shamma@hotmail.com, Khalip@fpe.upsi.edu.my

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJAREMS/v13-i4/22908> DOI:10.6007/IJAREMS/v13-i4/22908

Published Online: 08 October 2024

## Abstract

The research aims to build a rigorous understanding of the employees' perceptions of leadership styles that influence team performance. Furthermore, investigates which type (s) of leadership could influence employees' performance at Public Transportation in Dubai, the UAE. The study employed a quantitative research approach—a survey method using questionnaires to collect data and to analyze the employees' perceptions of leadership styles (shared leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, Aversive Leadership) to achieve team performance (Effectiveness, Efficiency). A cross-sectional study was conducted (using a reliable and validated questionnaire) to collect data from 281 employees including Chief Executive Officers, Directors, Executive Directors, Managers, and Experts who work in Public Transportation located within the Emirate of Dubai, the UAE. The results show that leadership styles (seven styles), and team performance (two dimensions), with mean values ranging from (4.17 to 4.26), (4.10 to 4.20), respectively. The correlational analysis showed that leadership styles and team performance have a positive strong relationship at a significant level ( $r = 0.701$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Furthermore. The regression analyses show that  $R^2$  score is 0.497, indicating that variations in leadership styles explain up to 49.7% of the variation in team performance. Overall, the results indicate that leadership styles significantly influence team performance ( $\beta = 0.58$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ). In conclusion, within the study context, leadership styles are being practiced at a very high level and have a significant influence on organizational performance. The implications of this research indicate that leadership styles must be encouraged in improving team performance in public sectors.

**Keywords:** Leadership, Team Performance, Public Sector, Effectiveness, Efficiency

## Introduction

The present paper investigates the influence of leadership styles on team performance. The dynamic nature of the world validates the need for novel approaches in organizational management. While the impact of leadership styles on team performance has been extensively studied globally, there is a scarcity of recent research addressing its specific influence in the UAE region. Several studies (e.g., Paukkuri, 2015; Liu, Hu, Li, Wang, & Lin,

2014; Pickeral, Evans, Hughes, & Hutchison 2009; Tough, 2009) have been carried out on the theory. While carrying out his study, Paukkuri (2015) observed that leadership was ambiguous. However, it generally concentrates more on the organization than on the individual.

As the above author suggests, leadership styles reflect management that shares its functions. Consequently, the approach to leadership is viewed as distributional, as tasks are shared among various persons or parties. The sharing of tasks leads to effectiveness, presenting in mind the strengths of the individuals being considered. Further, Paukkuri (2015) observed that leadership manifests through dividing duties, building teams, and assigning roles. The approach is top-down mainly since the purpose is to control and manage operations within an organization. According to Waldman, Wang, and Zhang (2016), teams increasingly distribute functional leadership roles to participants in those areas where they display the required knowledge. Recognizing this role, researchers such as Lord, et al. (2017) have commenced efforts to shift their study areas from vertical to horizontal influence and shared leadership.

Organizations have long hunted for ways to improve the performances of employees (Abu-Elhassan, Elsayed, & Soliman, 2016; Caillier, 2014) to realize positive well organizational results of business entities. Organizations are social systems, which accept human resources as one of the key factors for attaining competitive advantage and influencing organizational success (Khalifa, 2018). Attaining competitive advantage relies on the leaders' skills and abilities in managing diversity and executing progressively complex business strategies (Alareefi et al., 2019). Leadership plays a critical part in developing an effective organization. It focuses on the development of followers and their needs. There are different leadership styles, and they differ widely in terms of directing and guiding the employees and subordinates. There is a consensus that leadership practices are important and that they can enhance the performance of employees by taking advantage of the effective mix of motivators (Alharthi et al., 2019).

Dubai, as part of the United Arab Emirates, stands out as one of the world's fastest-growing cities, underscoring the need for top-notch infrastructure. Recognizing the significance of a sophisticated transportation network, the Dubai government is committed to advancing public transport and enhancing road infrastructure. In the road transportation sector, where skilled and experienced personnel are essential, retaining competent staff is critical. High organizational commitment contributes to employee retention, reducing turnover costs and maintaining stability within the workforce. Effective teamwork and organizational commitment contribute to streamlined processes, reducing inefficiencies and unnecessary costs. This is particularly relevant in the road transportation sector, where fuel costs, maintenance expenses, and operational overheads can significantly impact the organization's financial performance. A workforce that is committed to the organization and functions well as a team tends to experience higher levels of job satisfaction and morale. This positive work environment not only enhances employee well-being but also contributes to a collaborative and supportive culture, which is essential for the road transportation sector's demanding and often stressful work conditions.

In Taha, Zanin, and Osaili's (2023), study, both styles of leadership showed a positive correlation with job satisfaction, commitment, and standard practices. Previous research has also highlighted the positive association of transformational leadership with commitment and overall work-life quality (Kim, Im, & Shin, 2021). Transformational leadership directs employees' focus toward long-term goals and serves as a social resource in helping them navigate challenging situations, fostering innovation, and promoting a supportive work environment. Furthermore, nuanced aspects of risk management, examining organizational culture, the manager-employee relationship, and their attitudes and behaviors (Andrade et al., 2021). Taha et al (2020b), suggested a focus on management practices from a psychological angle to understand employee behavior. They emphasized uncovering the factors that drive commitment among employees and establishing a commitment-oriented management system. This approach seeks to bridge the gap between knowledge, attitude, and practical implementation, ultimately improving performance (Taha et al., 2020a, b). Recent studies have explored the finer aspects of risk management, including organizational culture, the dynamics between managers and employees, and their attitudes and behaviors (de Andrade et al., 2021; Zanin, Stedefeldt, da Silva, da Cunha, & Luning, 2021; Jespersen et al., 2019).

Studying the concept of team performance is also significant. According to Burke et al. (2007), one of the reasons is that collaboration plays a notable role in group setups. As formations bring together individuals with a common objective, teams are critical in pursuing organizational goals. Against this backdrop, the primary expectation of teamwork is to yield positive performance for organizations. As Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993), observed, self-reliant employees rarely exist. Rather, employees depend on each other while carrying out their tasks in serving their organizations. If employees need the assistance of their colleagues, it becomes essential to explore the performance and try to improvise ways to improve collective efforts. Team performance is dependent on the effectiveness of teams. Thus, research on organizational performance is critical in helping with the disaggregation of effectiveness. Such an angle leads to the establishment that, contrary to the existence of effective teams, disjointed teams also exist. However, unlike the former, the latter teams often yield dismal performance, thus compromising organizational goals (Reiter-Palmon, Wigert, & de Vreede, 2011). In many cases, team failure is linked to strategic concerns. Consequently, researching the concept is vital in highlighting organizational operations and possible improvement methods. Differently seen as team effectiveness, team performance is, thus, key in organization-based studies.

Another significant consideration is the interplay between team performance and leadership. According to Bolden (2011), the role of leadership is to set goals, prepare teams of followers for their pursuit, and provide the conditions for them to execute plans. Goal alignment between organizational and individual aspirations assumes significance, as does the role of leadership in team building (Bolden, 2011). As a result, studies focused on explaining organizational performance are crucial because they help to illuminate the nature of the management and leadership of the organization. In addition, the interplay between leadership and team performance, a window for capturing the association between team performance and organizational commitment opens. Team performance has been a subject of research for a long time. In one study, Boakye (2015), indicated that the need to evaluate team performance has prevailed since ancient times. As Boakye (2015), asserted,

management, production, service, and sales teams are some of the most common types of groups whose performance takes center stage. Given their widespread use in the business environment, team performance is a crucial driver of organizational effectiveness.

### **Conceptual Framework of the Research**

The research adopts Conger and Pearce's (2003, p. 286) leadership framework, which looks at leadership as collective leading which is undertaken collectively by members of teams and vertical leadership, which is discharged by the supervisor based on seven major styles — Shared leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, and Aversive Leadership (Conger & Pearce, 2003). On the other hand, the research investigates team performance through the team performance framework introduced by Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001). According to Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001), team performance has two dimensions—effectiveness and efficiency. While effectiveness highlights the extent to which a team attains its quality expectations, efficiency involves observation of schedules and working based on cost estimates. Hence, effectiveness compares actual against projected outcomes. On the other hand, efficiency compares forecasted and actual inputs.

### **Research Aim and Objectives**

This study aims to build a rigorous understanding of the employees' perceptions of leadership styles that influence team performance and investigates the relationship between leadership and team performance at Public Transportation in Dubai, the UAE. The following objectives guide the study. The research questions are mapped into the following objectives.

1. Determine and classify leadership styles (Shared leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, and Aversive Leadership) that might enable the organization to have highly team performance (Effectiveness, Efficiency) and to explain the relationships between these leadership styles and team performance.
2. Investigate the direct influence of leaderships styles (Shared leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, Aversive Leadership) and global team performance (Effectiveness, Efficiency).

### **Leadership Styles**

The leadership styles considered include directive leadership, vertical directive leadership, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership. Directive leadership is viewed among the models of shared leadership. As a leading process, directive leadership entails offering task-focused recommendations or directions (Ghasabeh & Provitera, 2017). The leadership style has been advocated across knowledge–worker contexts because it provides structure to cater to tasks that are inherently unstructured. Vertical directive leadership seems more relevant to newly established teams.

The leadership is also expressible in instances involving peer conversation. It applies to cases where peers share ideas on tackling the given assignments. Transactional leadership is another model of leadership style. The transactional leadership model is contrasted with transformational leadership (Odumeru & Ogbonna, 2013). Also known as managerial leadership, transactional leadership focuses on the role that supervision plays in group

performance and the organization in general. It is interested in bringing compliance among followers to organizational ethos. As a result, a transactional leader relies on either rewards or punishments to ensure the workers' compliance with organizational operations. According to Odumeru and Ogbonna (2013), this leadership style applies more to emergencies and during project implementation periods. The transactional style of leadership exploits the basic levels of employee needs for satisfaction. Transactional leaders concentrate on the lower-rank needs of the followers. These leaders rely on the exchange model grounded on the extension of rewards for positive performance and using punishment for unsatisfactory performance.

The transformational leadership model is also considered a variant of shared leadership. In their research, Ghasabeh and Provitera (2017), made a significant contribution necessary for understanding leadership theory. Originally, Burns (1978), developed the transformational leadership concept. However, since then, the theory has undergone considerable evolution, leading to its current state. The leadership style emphasizes satisfying basic needs and deeper desires by inspiring followers. Consequently, the latter can produce novel ideas or solutions to emerging problems within groups. According to Ghasabeh and Provitera (2017), charisma is a strong concept of the transformational leadership theory. Thus, the successful implementation of this leadership style is highly dependent on the charismatic attributes of the leader. Furthermore, transformational leadership underscores the need to concentrate on human capital owing to its central role within the organizational setup; by paying attention to and recognizing people, their propensity to expend more effort for collective goals increases. As a charismatic leader, their transformational leadership motivates followers and helps them to commit to the organization's goals. Although the focus is on the leader, the model also highlights subordinates' roles in organizational environments. Thus, according to Ghasabeh and Provitera (2017), subordinate values and attitudes influence transformational leadership and its effectiveness. Mainly, transformational leadership is tasked with influencing employee attitudes and values to align them with organizational expectations which focus on the accomplishment of predetermined goals.

Unlike in the past, the contemporary business environment is mired in high uncertainty. The implication is that organizations need more adept leaders today than they did in the past. According to Ghasabeh and Provitera (2017), transformational leaders fit the dynamic business context since they are more creative and innovative. Key attributes of a transformational leader are the ability to align individual aspirations and organizational ones and the capacity to inspire the creation of novel ideas that lead to positive organizational outcomes. Transformational leadership has four significant variants and attributes that form the knowledge base that reflects its value to organizations. The four components are idealized influence, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation (Ghasabeh & Provitera, 2017). The idealized influence component is essential to developing a collective vision and enhancing relations between leaders and followers. On the other hand, leaders use individualized consideration to identify the individual desires of followers and take measures to meet them through empowerment.

The objective of transformational leadership is to build a learning environment and mobilize employees to pursue collective aspirations. When using intellectual stimulation, leaders intend to propel knowledge sharing within the organization to generate novel ideas

and find solutions to emerging concerns. Leaders also use inspirational motivation when interested in motivating followers. They achieve this objective by setting higher levels or standards of expectations for the followers. When used together, the four transformational leadership constituents are likely to significantly enhance organizational or group outcomes. However, as Ghasabeh and Provitera (2017) indicated, the effect is only possible within a knowledge economy. It is also deduced that, although the four components are informative towards establishing ties with shared leadership, the aspects of intellectual stimulation stand out since leaders have the duty of challenging their followers to push them to explore new ways of addressing organizational issues. In such a way, by assigning workers or followers, the responsibility of leading through the generation of helpful ideas takes an organization forward.

### **Team Performance**

The team is often hypothesized to have an influence on organizational performance. Boakye (2015) defined a team as a dynamic system that captures interrelationships between or among individuals linked together to pursue a common objective. The essence of team existence is to generate specific results. However, the measurement of results or performance differs across the groups. Despite the variance, all teams are assessed based on their output (Sohmen, 2013). Consequently, teams must focus on the deliverables, deadlines, and tasks set. Nonetheless, it is only sometimes possible to keep the highest level of intensity, which is necessary to yield positive performance. Questions concerning the sustainability of high-performance levels underscore the role of leadership within the group setups.

Human nature predisposes individuals to exhibit the need to belong to a specific team or group. The need for affiliation underscores the emotional component of workers, which the leaders should exploit in advancing the causes pursued by the organizations (Anderson, Baur, Griffith, & Buckley, 2017). One approach that leadership takes to achieve the set objective is to engage team members. Highly effective teams provide innovativeness, a crucial factor in performance and sustainability in organizations. The role of teams is evident given the high number of leading firms encouraging teamwork. For instance, the Royal Bank of Scotland demands that its employees engage in team activities (Edmondson & Roloff, 2009). Google also requires that its workers contribute to team activities that excite them by spending 20% of their time on such undertakings (Bersin, 2013). The practice is also widespread in consultancy organizations that encourage sharing among their members to generate novel ideas.

Effective teams are, thus, crucial in helping entities to attain the desirable results. Conversely, a disjointed team could lead to dismal performance and, in the process, jeopardize the set organizational goals (Anderson et al., 2017). Often, the failure of the team is linked to strategic problems, as well as poor delivery. Also viewed as team effectiveness, team performance is a significant factor that many organizations emphasize.

Presently, it is difficult to avoid working within a team. Even if an individual might not be a workgroup member, the chances are very high that such a person would eventually interact with the groups/teams in the course of their duties. According to Batistič, Černe, and Vogel (2017), a team is a dynamic living organism. The implication is that the team depicts characteristics of a living thing, and its features transcend those individual features of its

members. As well as operating in formal settings, teams work based on informal rules and other attributes, such as visions and emotions. The implication is that leadership is expected to steer groups/teams to yield the target results. Work efficiency has been linked to the team. According to Connelly and Gooty (2015), a team is essential to organizations since it enables them to accomplish tasks faster and more efficiently. This assumption is based on the idea that working as a group enhances better outcomes than those undertaking individually. Cooperation across various tasks is significant to the reduction of workloads for employees. This is achieved through the sharing of ideas or responsibilities. In addition, a team contributes to reducing work pressure per employee.

Consequently, reduced workload leads to faster completion of roles/tasks. However, sharing ideas or responsibilities does not negate that each worker needs a clearly defined role that suits his or her specialization. The role of leadership in the team is also important since organizations need to consider the levels of interest among employees in the project being undertaken. Showing trust in the workers' ability to execute roles positively affects efficiency and output, which are essential aspects of organizational performance. A team is also linked to the improvement of employee relations. Within organizations, a team allows employees to bond as they share various activities (Junker & van Dick, 2014). The members of teams feel valued by participating in different organizational activities leading to their successful completion. Scenarios, where members' input is required, are considered significant because they allow each member to appreciate the contributions or ideas of other employees. Moreover, a team is essential in the enhancement of unity among members.

A team is also regarded as a building block in creating accountable organizations. According to Oc and Bashshur (2013), each team member is accountable to the team. Moreover, teams have their leaders. Commanding or respected leaders require a high level of respect, and each subordinate should meet their obligations if they want to secure their places in the teams. Moreover, team members may fear that they could let their colleagues down; thus, they are likely to be dedicated to pursuing respect or praise from their peers. In addition, there is a low possibility that peer pressure could weigh down on team members. In such cases, morale remains high, leading to effective organizations. Overall, increased accountability is a precursor to increased productivity.

In the present times, the idea of learning organizations continues to evolve. Organizations now embrace learning more than they did in the past since the organizational environments have changed dramatically (Machogu, 2013). The nature of a team requires that all the members cooperate in completing assignments. Working as a group/team helps new members to learn from more experienced ones. Besides, teams/groups comprise members from different fields, implying that they have different skill sets and talents. Working as a group/team is, thus, an excellent opportunity for individuals to acquire new skills. Moreover, while working in a group/team, members get the chance to challenge competing ideas, leading to the identification of the most plausible options given the circumstances. Similarly, organizations can learn from their employees by allowing teams to work on issues and initiate solutions to organizational challenges.

Over the last half a century, some avenues for explaining a team concept have appeared. Based on the work of Boakye (2015), one of the methods is looking at the team as

a general philosophy of management or leadership. According to Boakye (2015), the team paradigm is also seen as a human resource management (HRM) approach. In addition, the researcher claimed that the team should be perceived as a management tool used to control and guide organizational change. Furthermore, a team has been viewed as a collection of individuals. The evolution of the team is essential to the present research. Throughout the history of organizational development, a team has evolved progressively. Between the 1940s and the 1970s, phrases such as 'workgroup', 'semi-autonomous work group', 'autonomous work group', 'groupthink', and 'high-performance group' became dominant within the organizational setup (Boakye, 2015). After that, a new set of phrases emerged. The terms were derived from team or team and labels, including work team, high-performance team, self-regulating team, self-managing team, and team working. Over the last few decades, the term team-working or teamwork has gained popularity.

In his study, Boakye (2015), indicated that teams had been used since time immemorial. In this regard, reference is made to management, service, production, and sales teams. On this basis, teams are favored and used by virtually all organizations. Teams are the drivers of organizational activities in both past and present times. Moreover, organizations state that all workers and other stakeholders must move as a team to achieve their goals. Consequently, the team-based approach is widely employed. Besides playing many roles, one of the leader's most influential roles is building strong teams capable of scaling high-performance levels. According to Sohmen (2013), a team builder is a strong individual capable of holding team members together while simultaneously ensuring that they are focused on pursuing the common objective. At the onset, teams start as a collection of strangers. At this stage, the leader must bring synergy and create a high-performing team.

From time to time, teams experience upheavals. Despite such setbacks, the leader should keep the group spirit alive. Leadership achieves the goal by providing a positive definition of work ethics, which sets the standards for the team (Thiel, Connelly, & Griffith, 2012). In essence, a good leader can nurture members into individuals who espouse the leader's dream. A leadership style plays a significant role in the process of team formation. In forming teams, leaders should track and ensure a true metamorphosis, which goes through four stages—forming, storming, norming, and performing (Sohmen, 2013). During the initial forming phase, team members are polite, and each one's roles could be more precise. Hence, at this stage, members largely depend on leadership for direction. Once roles become clear, teams shift to the storming stage, where some members question their positions. Hence, leadership should respond by explaining to the followers to ensure clarity. Subsequently, the norming stage is encountered, which entails a situation where each member understands and accepts their role. In other words, members share the leader's vision and are committed to the organization. Finally, the group transitions to the performing stage, a phase where the group can actualize its goals. In the final phase, the hierarchy and culture of the team are well-defined and unambiguous. As a result, the exit of a member does not impact the entity. Crucially, well-developed teams need strong leadership so that success will be obtained.

One of the crucial roles of shared leadership is the empowerment of teams. According to Whetten and Cameron (2011), empowerment, which is based on developing others' sense of self-efficacy, personal control, self-determinism, trust, and meaning, is important to team building. According to Sohmen (2013), the leader should be able to communicate with team



members effectively. Positive communication is desired due to its role in building trust among team members. In turn, trust is crucial in establishing long-lasting relationships among those involved. Positive relationships are essential in motivating team members to pursue group goals.

Leadership and teams also intersect on the issue of goal orientation. Organizations have objectives that they seek to attain in the future in order to succeed. Therefore, successful organizations constantly align their aims with their leaders and teams. Being understood differently, organizational goals must be balanced with the team member's personal goals. This underscores the need for members to assume ownership of organizational or group aspirations. In such a case, the levels of commitment of employees often grow, thus leading to an increase in the chances of realizing the organizational goals. Goal orientation is particularly significant in planned and unplanned change initiatives. Consequently, leaders should prepare their teams to anticipate shifts or changes if their organizations are to excel during change. However, the realization of objectives includes shared responsibilities, focus, and commitment among team members in pursuing collective goals.

In their article, Dinwoodie et al (2015), observed that senior- and mid-level managers had the task of creating change and responding to change initiatives that emanate from the above. For effective leadership of these initiatives, managers should navigate the change at three levels: the self, the others, and the organization. Regarding the self, the point of interest is how to handle the change challenge as a role model. The managers should reconcile their leadership styles to reflect the surrounding circumstances. In other words, the leader should be ready to respond to the changing situation.

Regarding the others, reference is made to assisting followers/employees in getting through and coping with the change. Shared leadership makes it possible to understand other people's perspectives, responses, and feelings before deciding. The objective is to build relationships, win fence-sitters, and secure the commitment of every stakeholder toward the change process. Concerning the organization, Dinwoodie et al (2015), observed that the issue of interest is how to lead change within the larger context of the organization, bearing in mind both political and cultural realities. In this regard, teams must align with the organizational expectations to strengthen the capacity to effect change.

Whether team performance has a positive influence on organizations or not has attracted and continues to fuel debates. Nonetheless, a popular perspective is that leadership is associated with several organizational outcomes. In his research, Anttila (2014, p. 13) indicated that, despite the prominence of team performance in modern work environments, things used to be much different. Over a century ago, a significant shift occurred as contemporary organizational frameworks replaced typical assembly lines. Accompanying the development is the change in the emphasis from individualistic to collective work approaches. The elevation of team performance is traceable to events surrounding the first and second World Wars as countries united in scales hitherto unimagined. In addition, Anttila (2014), credits the team performance concept to the popular studies by Hawthorne. The studies covering the 1920s and 1930s underscored the benefits that resulted from team performance and began influencing organizations' thinking about work. Following the development, a

significant shift occurred as organizations changed their models from the typical assembly line.

Team performance is an essential concept in the organizational context today. Referring to earlier works on team performance, Zincirkiran et al (2015), indicated that social and technical goals were the basis of research on the topic. However, individual targets were the primary basis for practical work. Focusing on the period between the 1960s and the 1970s, Zincirkiran et al (2015), posited that studies grounded in social psychology established that team processes and interactions affected organizational outcomes. Understanding team performance requires a clear description of a team. According to Zincirkiran et al (2015), a team is a group of persons with complementary skills working together to achieve predetermined goals. The implication is that some objects must exist before bringing different individuals together. Through the integration of skills, it is possible to attain high-performance levels.

However, a contrast is made between teams and groups. A group is viewed merely as individuals occupying a given space. Consequently, a team is more significant than a collection of people. A working group or functional team members face their tasks independently, although they first meet to work towards a common goal. As a small group, a team pursues a common goal, which moves it closer to the performance targets. Members' attachment to the group (also viewed as commitment) directs members to collectively work together to succeed (Zincirkiran, Emhan, and Yasar, 2015). Membership diversity ensures that members can easily overcome deficiencies or weaknesses. The implication is that, in a team, members undertake measures aimed at bridging the shortcomings of their colleagues. It is also possible to benefit from the strengths of each team member. Task interdependence is one of the keys defining the elements of teams. Because of the connectivity, members must reach a consensus on achieving optimal results.

Based on the literature, team performance and performance are interrelated. According to Zincirkiran et al (2015), the performance of an organization largely depends on the commitment of employees rather than merely being pegged on the maximization of individual ability. Furthermore, possessing excellent skills counts for less if the workers lack a commitment to the organization. As a part of the efforts to enhance the chances of success, Zincirkiran et al (2015), observed that organizations need to factor in both economic and social attributes of performance by investing significant resources in employee loyalty.

The practice of empowerment has become necessary because of the rise of knowledge workers. Knowledge workers represent a class of workers with a high degree of education and skills in their areas of specialization (Trammell, 2016). Consequently, such people have innovative ideas about work organization and execution. Given the freedom to express themselves, such workers often deliver incredible results. However, any leader's attempt to micromanage such workers often proves self-defeating. Against this backdrop, leaders need to equip the workers, share their vision, and step back. In such a scenario, the leader operates as a service provider and only focuses on establishing a team with the necessary resources and tools to undertake their roles. Teams of knowledge workers only need feedback and words of encouragement to continue performing their duties.

The structure of an organization is central to the functioning of shared leadership and team performance. As Trammell (2016), asserted, flattened organizations provide the springboard that knowledge teams need to perform. Furthermore, Trammell (2016), indicated that organizational structure can either energize or undermine teams. In contrast to agile organizations that empower knowledge-based teams, bureaucratic and hierarchical structures significantly impede team performance. Entities with multiple layers can drain teams of their energy, proving counterproductive. In addition, Trammell (2016), emphasized the need to create empowering policies. These establish procedures that increase employee participation, energy, and morale. Changes in technologies, market conditions, and a constantly changing global economy have necessitated the flattening of organizational structures.

Given the interdependence of organizations, the need for a free flow of ideas has gained popularity. All workers also need to learn continuously. Since the changes are dynamic and constant, there is a need for dynamic knowledge, which is possible through sharing ideas. Trammell (2016), concluded that organizational competence cannot be attained when a small group of formal leaders makes all the critical decisions. On the contrary, decisions should reflect the ideas of each player or member of the team, a scenario that ensures that diverse ideas are factored in.

The phrase 'task interdependence' relates to the dependence between two components or, in some cases, among three or more attributes (Ullah & Parker, 2013). Task interdependence dispenses a significant role in the hunt for organizational goals and, in its absence, the chances of succeeding are greatly minimized. Using teams to leverage workers' knowledge across organizations is taking place. With the changing landscape, it becomes necessary to interrogate whether the traditional leadership models are still effective. Existing research has underscored the value of teamwork in pursuing organizational aims. As Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001), noted, the significance of teams towards the success of innovative processes is well known. However, for teams to perform well, they must collaborate and work collectively as a closely knit unit. Essentially, the degree and quality of interaction affect the ability of teams to attain their desired goals.

### **Effect of Leadership Styles on Team Performance**

Among those researchers who interrogated the association between leadership styles and group performance are (Wang et al., 2017). According to the scholars, querying the often-mentioned relationship between shared leadership and organizational outcomes cannot be overemphasized. Consequently, Wang et al (2017), investigated the possible impact of leader–member exchange (LMX) on shared leadership among teams. The researchers drew upon the group engagement model, suggesting that LMX differentiation had a negative effect on the effectiveness of teams. The implication is that the existence of a gap between leaders and members has negative effects on organizational citizenship behavior, which also leads to reduced team effectiveness. After testing predictions based on data drawn from 340 respondents, Wang et al (2017), found that shared leadership mediates the link between LMX differentiation across both organizational citizenship behavior and team performance.

Han et al (2018), also examined the association between leadership styles and team performance. They explored the effect that leadership has on student project team activities

and outcomes. Consequently, the authors concentrated on the connection between the leadership style and team processes—namely, goal commitment, coordination, knowledge sharing, and team performance. To investigate the association, Han et al. (2018) carried out two distinct surveys involving 158 university students who were conducting projects in teams at a university. From their research findings, the authors established that shared leadership has a positive effect on the performance of teams. In addition, they found that each process attribute mediated the relationship but decreed that shared leadership's effect on team performance was indirect rather than direct.

Although the study by Han et al (2018), made a significant contribution to the literature on shared leadership, it has some limitations. For instance, the study was limited in its sampling approach since only a homogenous sample of students was used. The implication is on the generalizability of the findings to the rest of the population. In yet another research on shared leadership, Barnett and Weidenfeller (2016), conceded that the leadership style has been a subject of investigation for a long time. As the authors indicate, the voluminous works of Pearce and Conger were the major drivers of interest in shared leadership. After an exhaustive review of the literature, Barnett and Weidenfeller (2016), opined that the state of knowledge on the topic is largely fragmented, besides being complex and arduous to navigate. As a result, it remains largely difficult to comprehend the topic and get an informed idea about the concept and its organizational effects. To discuss the topic, Barnett and Weidenfeller (2016), conducted meta-analytic research focusing on published empirical studies.

In their research, Bligh et al (2006), considered the relevance of self-leadership and shared leadership for team-based operations. When conducting the study, the authors relied on a meso-level theoretical framework, outlining an association between both sets of leadership and team performance knowledge creation. Further, Bligh et al. (2006) established that shared leadership had proved critical for the shift in organizations from traditional hierarchical arrangements to modern-day flatter entities. Team performance yields various outcomes in organizations. For instance, the Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001) study revealed that the variable influences individual success among team members in terms of learning and satisfaction. In addition, the study documented that project success is dependent upon team performance.

### **Methodology**

This section presents the methods and techniques that the study intends to use. Through a survey design, the thesis undertakes quantitative research. The cross-sectional strategy entails collecting data at a point in time, which is ideal for carrying out the study because data will be sought once rather than over time. Regarding data collection methods, the researcher employed a random sampling technique. The random sampling technique is a probabilistic approach that gives participants an equal chance of being selected for investigation. The instrument of choice for the study is the questionnaire based on the existing scales that measure the three variables under investigation. The first variable measured is leadership styles; the second is organizational commitment, and the third is team performance. The analysis is the next stage of the study after data collection. The data collected was entered into the SPSS software and refined through a cleaning process. In particular, the software assisted in identifying missing values as well as outliers. After data cleaning, the analysis

focused on addressing the research questions. Although inferential statistics form the bedrock of the study, descriptive data were captured as a basis for explaining the variables under investigation. The aspects of data reliability and validity were explored in detail. In addition, matters about statistical methods, such as regression and hypotheses testing, were canvassed. The researcher then used regression analysis to establish the effect of leadership styles on the outcomes of team performance. In addition, the hypotheses were tested to give credence to the findings.

### Analysis and Presentation of Results

This section is to elaborate the data analysis that reflects the outcome of the research and answer all the research questions and hypotheses. The questions and hypothesis were formulated to find the linkage in relationships and influence between the of leadership styles, and team performance.

Table 4.1

#### *Response Rate*

Target Sample	Participants	Non-response
285	281	4
100%	98.60%	1.40%

Table 4.1 presents data on the target sample, participants, non-response rate, and their respective proportions. The non-response rate of 1.40% is sufficiently low to warrant any corrective action.

### Leadership Styles

The data analysis sought to answer the first research questions. The leadership style includes measuring leaderships' characteristics at the government entity in the UAE—i.e., Shared Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, and finally, Aversive Leadership. Table 4.2, below, demonstrates the leadership style items' minimum values, maximum values, mean values, and standard deviation values.

Table 4.2

#### *Leadership Style Factors Analysis*

Leadership Styles	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Shared Leadership	2.00	5.00	4.21	0.70
Transformational Leadership	2.00	5.00	4.26	0.88
Transactional Leadership	2.00	5.00	4.23	0.65
Directive Leadership	3.00	5.00	4.26	0.692
Empowerment Individual	2.00	5.00	4.17	0.62
Empowerment Team	2.00	5.00	4.19	0.62
Aversive Leadership	3.00	5.00	4.19	0.63
Total	2.00	5.00	4.21	0.70

Table 4.2 demonstrates the leadership style, which comprises shared leadership, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, directive leadership, empowerment (individual and teams), and aversive leadership. The overall items of shared leadership averaged 4.21 out of 5, while the standard deviation scored 0.70. The current average of 4.21 out of 5, indicates a very high level of agreement among the participants with the shared leadership concept by 84%. Transformational leadership indicates a very high average level of 4.26 and a standard deviation of 0.88; this indicates that the behavior is very highly practiced and participant opinion is not largely dispersed around the mean. On the other hand, transactional leadership indicates a very high-level average with the mean of 4.23 while the standard deviation is 0.65; this indicates that the behavior is very highly practiced and participant opinion is not primarily spread around the mean. Directive leadership indicates a very high-level average of the mean of 4.26. In contrast, the standard deviation of 0.692 indicates that the behavior is highly practiced as it is not primarily spread around the mean. The empowerment individuals dimension indicates a high-level average of the mean of 4.17 and the standard deviation of 0.62; this indicates that the behavior is highly practiced and participant opinion is not largely dispersed around the mean. The empowerment teams dimension indicates a high- a level average of the mean of 4.19 and a standard deviation of 0.62; this indicates that the behavior is highly practiced and participant opinion is not largely dispersed around the mean. Finally, the aversive dimension indicates a high-level average of the mean of 4.19 and a standard deviation of 0.63, this indicates that the behavior is highly not practiced (data reversed) and participant opinion is not largely dispersed around the mean.

Overall, leadership has seven styles. The mean values ranged from 4.17 to 4.26, while the standard deviation values fell between 0.62 and 0.88. The figures point to a very high presence of the attribute among leadership. In addition, the standard deviation around one indicates the presence of no significant variance among responses. This shows that the behavior is relatively not dispersed. Overall, the results show a very high presence of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and directive leadership while a high level of presence with empowerment for both individuals and teams. However, aversive leadership is the least modestly practiced in the context. The results exhibit a high presence of shared leadership within the research context. The highest mean was 4.26 and the lowest mean was 4.17.

### **Team Performance**

The team performance concept has eight sub-items. The results are presented in Table 4.16, below, which demonstrates the team performance items' minimum values, maximum values, mean values, and standard deviation values.

**Team Performance Factors**

This analysis of the findings considers effectiveness and efficiency.

Table 4.3

*Team Performance Factors' Analysis*

Team Performance	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Effectiveness	2.00	5.00	4.200	0.668
Efficiency	2.00	5.00	4.100	0.680
Total	2.00	5.00	4.160	0.674

Based on Table 4.3, the team performance factors indicate a high level of effective leadership with an average of 4.20 and a standard deviation of 0.66. This indicates that the behavior is highly practiced, and the standard deviation result indicates that the sample is not largely dispersed around the mean. On the other hand, the team's efficiency also indicates a high average of the mean of 4.10, while the standard deviation of 0.680 indicates that the sample is not dispersed around the mean. Overall, the context shows that the team performance concept is practiced to a high level. The highest mean was 4.20 and the lowest mean was 4.10.

Table 4.4

*Leadership Styles and Team Performance Correlations*

Correlations		Leadership Styles	Team Performance
Leadership Styles	Pearson Correlation	1	.701**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	281	281
Team Performance	Pearson Correlation	.701**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	281	281

Correlation Coefficient Value (r)	Interpretation Correlation Coefficients
0.000 - 0.199	Very weak
0.200 - 0.399	Weak
0.400 - 0.599	Moderate
0.600 - 0.799	Strong
0.800 - 1.00	Very Strong

Source: Sugiyono (2013).

Table 4.4 shows that the overall correlation between leadership styles and team performance is 0.701,  $p=0.000<0.05$ . The results show a strong relationship between the two variables at a significant level.

Table 4.5

*Collinearity between Leadership Styles and Team Performance*

Model	Unstandardized coefficient		Standardized coefficient	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	STD. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
Team performance	0.623	.10	.330	3041	.000	.729	1.001

Independent variable: leadership styles

Table 4.5 shows that tolerance of less than 0.20 of team performance indicates a problem with multicollinearity (Garson, 2004). The VIF result is 1.001, which is an appropriate indicator.

The following part explains the multiple regression analysis of leadership styles on team performance and uncovers the influence of leadership styles on team performance. The objective is attainable based on multiple regression analysis. All five dimensions are considered individually before a collective view is captured.

Table 4.6

*Regression Analysis: The Influence of Leadership Styles on Team Performance*

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.587 <sup>a</sup>	.497	.439	.4981

a. Predictors: (Constant), Shared Leadership Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, Aversive Leadership.

Table 4.6 highlights that the R<sup>2</sup> score is 0.497, indicating that variations in leadership styles explain up to 49.7% of the variation in team performance.

Table 4.7

*Regression Output Between Leadership styles and Team Performance*

Model		Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	Shared Leadership	0.36	.321	5.33	.000
2	Transformational Leadership	.027	.410	7.103	.000
3	Transactional Leadership	.032	.351	6.321	.000
4	Directive leadership	.031	.321	6.679	.000
5	Empowerment Individual	.029	.481	4.313	.000
6	Empowerment Team	.019	.299	5.20	.050
7	Aversive Leadership	.028	.201	3.23	.081

a. Dependent Variable: Team Performance



The values in Table 4.7 reveal the relationships between shared leadership styles and their influence on team performance. The findings show that the p-value of shared leadership (0.000) is lower than the alpha value ( $\beta=-0.321$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), which indicates its significant influence on team performance. The other regression result shows that transformational leadership (0.000) is lower than the alpha value ( $\beta=-0.410$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), which indicates its significant influence on team performance. The other regression result shows that transactional leadership significantly influences team performance at a 0.01 level of significance ( $\beta =-0.351$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Similarly, the results indicate that the directive leadership significantly influences team performance at a 0.01 level of significance ( $\beta=-0.321$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). The results show that empowered individuals significantly influence team performance at a 0.01 level of significance ( $\beta =-0.481$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). The findings also affirm that empowerment team significantly influences team performance at a 0.01 level of significance ( $\beta =-0.299$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Further, aversive leadership insignificantly influences team performance ( $\beta =-0.201$ ,  $p.>0.05$ ). Overall, the results of the study’s hypotheses were supported except for the component belonging to the aversive leadership.

Table 4.8  
*Regression Output Between Leadership Styles and Team Performance: Variables*

Overall Leadership Styles		Team Performance			
		R		t	Sig.
		Effectiveness	Efficiency		
1	Shared Leadership	0.58	0.537	5.43	.000
2	Transformational Leadership	0.53	0.49	6.10	.000
3	Transactional Leadership	0.62	0.63	6.23	.000
4	Directive leadership	0.59	0.58	6.69	.000
5	Empowerment Individual	0.58	0.53	5.13	.000
6	Empowerment Team	0.56	0.55	4.29	.030
7	Aversive Leadership	0.23	0.21	3.21	.084
Regression Between Leadership styles and Team Performance		0.59		4.50	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Shared Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, Aversive Leadership.

Shared leadership exhibits a positive association with team performance in terms of effectiveness ( $r=0.58$ ), ( $p<0.01$ ) and efficiency ( $r=0.537$ ), ( $p< 0.001$ ). Transformational leadership exhibits a positive association with team performance in terms of effectiveness ( $r = 0.53$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ) and efficiency ( $r = 0.49$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ). Likewise, transactional leadership, directive leadership, empowerment individual, and empowerment team show statistically significant associations with team performance in terms of effectiveness ( $r = 0.62$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ), ( $r = 0.59$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ), ( $r = 0.58$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ), and ( $r = 0.56$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ), respectively, and efficiency ( $r = 0.63$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ), ( $r = 0.58$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ), ( $r = 0.53$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ), and ( $r = 0.55$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ), respectively. However, the results for aversive leadership are statistically insignificant ( $r = 0.23$ ), ( $p > 0.05$ ), ( $r = 0.21$ ), ( $p > 0.05$ ), respectively. for both mentioned team performance categories. These findings support hypothesis H2 regarding shared leadership, transformational, transactional, directive, empowerment individual, and empowerment

team but do not support hypothesis H2 regarding aversive leadership. Leadership styles demonstrate a positive association with team performance ( $r = 0.59$ ), ( $p < 0.001$ ).

Table 4.9

*ANOVA Test Results (H3)*

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	250.630	2	25.121	190.700	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	130.370	350	.178		
	Total	381.000	352			

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational commitment

b. Predictors: (Constant), Shared Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, Aversive Leadership.

The ANOVA results in Table 4.9 indicate the p-value (0.000), a figure that is lower than the suggested alpha (0.01). The findings highlight that the model is significant owing to the F value of 190.700. The implication is that leadership has a significant effect on team performance. During the same period, the team's performance was shown to be at a very high level. The findings point to a significant connection between leadership styles and the level of performance achieved by the team.

### Discussion and Conclusion

Leadership styles and team performance are critical components in present-day organizations. This prompted the present study to investigate the link between the three variables. The current research sought to explicate leadership's role in organizational commitment and team performance within the public organization context. In the course of the study, it emerged that, despite the shared leadership topic attracting considerable interest from the scholarship community, much remained to discover, especially regarding the UAE environment. To investigate the topic, the research echoed findings similar to those of Chiung-Hui (2016), who noted that both empirical and theoretical literature relating to the consequences and antecedents of shared leadership was relatively scarce.

The current study establishes that, within the study context, leadership styles are practiced. All the seven leadership styles are present—namely, shared leadership transformational leadership, transactional leadership, directive leadership, empowerment individual, empowerment team and aversive leadership. The results show a very high presence of shared leadership, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and indicative of directive leadership attributes. Conversely, aversive leadership is not practiced or widespread in this context. This leads to the conclusion that, on average, shared leadership, transformational, transactional, and directive leadership styles have a very high presence in public government organizations. The findings are consistent with those of Davidson (2005), and Varadarajan Chandrasekaran, and Patterson (2018). The latter writers found a strong presence of shared leadership within the UAE context while Davidson (2005), supported the need for new leadership owing to the very high-paced changes within organizational environments.

In the research, team performance comprised effective and efficient team performance components. Both dimensions of team performance yielded high mean values, but standard deviations were not largely dispersed around the mean. These values led to the observation that a high level of team performance characterized the public organization entity context. The outcome was shared by a large number of respondents, as evidenced by the small values of the standard deviations. Overall, the high level of team performance is indicative of the role of high shared leadership in the public entity that is investigated.

Establishing the relationship between leadership styles and team performance was one of the key objectives of the study. The study confirms that the transformational leadership component of leadership styles had a strong influence on team performance; that the transactional leadership style component of leadership styles had a strong positive relationship with team performance; and that the shared leadership had a strong positive relationship with team performance. However, the aversive leadership component showed an insignificant association with team performance. Nonetheless, on average, leadership styles had a strong influence on team performance. Comparisons with the literature generate insights into the value of leadership. In particular, Wang et al (2017), study indicated that gaps between leaders and team members had negative effects on collective outcomes and overall team effectiveness. Moreover, their research found that shared leadership played a mediating role in the interplay between LMX differentiation and organizational citizenship behavior as well as team performance. Thus, the current findings are in harmony with those of the Wang et al (2017) study.

The other study referenced is Han et al (2018), investigation which examined the association between shared leadership and team performance. The authors established that shared leadership had a positive effect on team performance; however, their study averred that shared leadership's interplay with team performance supports the current study outcomes. Han et al (2018), research yields findings like those of the present study by identifying a relationship between the study variables.

### **Contribution of the Study**

A significant question for researchers in the field of management and leadership is the degree to which a team plays a valuable role in the organizational description of work and the explanation of its influence within such environments. Despite extensive literature, however, one of the persisting concerns is the orientation toward fashionableness (Weiss, Razinskas, Backmann, & Hoegl, 2018). Often, fashions are associated with empty fads, as well as hyperbole. Hence, such trends hold little or no value to organizations. In this regard, reference is made to the blanket assumption that leadership styles influence team performance and organizational commitment. In essence, the perception is that high levels of leadership precede increased organizational commitment and performance. In the same way, past studies such as that of Mercurio (2015), show that high levels of organizational commitment provide the basis for enhanced performance. Based on the findings by Sohmen (2013), the knowledge intensity within organizations implies that competent leaders are those that are capable of steering their groups through the vagaries of change without disruptions. In the absence of effective leadership, in accordance with Sohmen (2013), teams become rudderless.

The significance of this research is underscored by the contemporary challenges faced by public transportation in Dubai, including rapid urbanization, technological advancements, and increasing expectations for efficient and sustainable transportation services. By exploring the potential benefits of leadership styles, this study seeks to provide actionable insights that can contribute to the development of effective leadership strategies tailored to the unique context of the public transportation sector in Dubai. Furthermore, the research aims to incorporate up-to-date empirical data to highlight the urgency and relevance of the study. By understanding the current state of team performance in the public transportation sector, this research endeavors to offer practical recommendations for leadership practices that can drive positive change and contribute to the overall success of public transportation agencies in Dubai.

The significance of this research is that it seeks to enhance the understanding of various leadership styles (Shared leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Directive Leadership, Empowerment Individual, Empowerment Team, and Aversive Leadership) and organizational commitment (Affective, Continuance, Normative), an area that has not been extensively explored (public transportation in Dubai, the UAE). There is a growing interest in examining leadership styles that impact organizational commitment and performance within the public sector. This study aims to assist public sector management in identifying crucial leadership behaviors and practices that play a significant role in encouraging employees to adhere to safe procedures. By uncovering opportunities for improvement and formulating motivating policies, this research can contribute to fostering employee commitment and enhancing overall performance.

Furthermore, the investigation aims to shed light on the reasons behind employees' reluctance to implement safe procedures, hindering the achievement of previously agreed-upon organizational goals. The anticipated outcomes of this research are poised to provide valuable insights to public sector management, enabling them to refine organizational performance and successfully attain their goals. The positive outcomes observed in previous research endeavors have motivated researchers in the public sector to advocate for an exploration into employee commitment to implementing safe and standard procedures within organizations.

Conducting such studies not only adds to the existing literature but also helps in delineating effective leadership styles that influence employee commitment to implementing safe standards and procedures. The current study is different from earlier studies in that it investigates different styles of leadership influences on different types of commitment and different types of performance, particularly efficiency and effectiveness. This vital research, in turn, contributes to the improvement of organizational performance across processes, people, and products.

### **Recommendations**

Further study is required to reproduce the results in a larger and more diverse group. Conducting research on bigger populations would also allow for an examination of the results' applicability across the UAE's various nationalities, age, and ethnic groupings. The results could be enriched by linking entities at the local level as well as at the federal level, working

in various segments of the government public sector. Future research should include employees' perceptions of leadership styles involved in multiple executive committees. Future studies could also focus on the public sector by adopting a broader scope and examine the interaction between shared leadership and environmental elements within organizations. Other research could be conducted from the bottom to the top in organizations to assess the employees' views and perspective, upwards to shared leadership behavior. This could offer a 360-degree angle on the topic, which could gauge the impact of the change management that might happen in an organization in the future, pinpointing the exact element(s) that might affect the behavior and the environment in the public sector.

The research contributes to leadership styles and team performance literature. Although shared leadership significantly affects team performance. For the leadership style to have more effect, it is recommended to encourage workers to participate more in the organizational activities, which aligns with the suggestion by Briner and Rousseau (2011). Ensuring an enhanced understanding of organizational goals and reconciling them with those of employees would prove critical.

The current study drew its data from one public organization based in the UAE. Being a government institution, its general approach to operations might differ from those conducting activities in the private sector. Consequently, in the future, research might consider exploring the issue by drawing on a larger sample that includes companies from the private sector. There is a need to dedicate additional research to analyzing mitigating factors regarding shared leadership and organizational commitment to organization type. Moreover, the research also recommends the extension of the study to investigate the connection between shared leadership and workers' affective commitment across various types of private enterprises. Similarly, conducting a study involving data from another jurisdiction or country would aid in conducting a comparative analysis of the topic.

## References

- Abu-Elhassan, A. E. E., Elsayed, Y. N., & Soliman, D. M. (2016). The Influences of Modern Technologies on Generations' Job Satisfaction: Luxor Hotels Case Study. *International Journal of Heritage, Tourism, and Hospitality*, 7(2), 156-169.
- Alareefi, N. A. O. M., Abuelhassan, A. E., Khalifa, G. S. A., Nusari, M., & Ameen, A. (2019). Employees Innovative Behaviour: Evidence from Hospitality Industry. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(1), 214–229.
- Alharthi, B. A. F. H., Khalifa, G. S. A., Ameen, A., Isaac, O., & Al-Shibami, A. H. (2019). Investigating the Influence of Strategic Planning on University Operational Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment in the UAE. *International Business Management*, 13(2), 49–62.
- Anderson, H. J., Baur, E. J., Griffith, A. J., & Buckley, R. M. (2017). What works for you may not work for (Gen) me: Limitations of present leadership theories for the new generation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 245–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.08.001>.
- Anttila, E. (2014). *Components of organizational commitment: A case study consisting of line managers from Finnish industrial company*. Finland: University of Tampere Thesis.

- Batistič, S., Černe, M., & Vogel, B. (2017). Just how multi-level is leadership research? A document co-citation analysis 1980–2013 on leadership constructs and outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 86–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.007>.
- Bersin, J. (2013, August 20). Why Google's 20% time rule matters. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2013/08/why-googles-20-time-rule-matters>
- Bligh, M. C., Pearce, C. L., & Kohles, J. C. (2006). The importance of self- and shared leadership in team based knowledge work: A meso-level model of leadership dynamics. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), 296–318.
- Boakye, E. O. (2015). *The impact of teamwork on employee performance*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284732729\\_The\\_impact\\_of\\_teamwork\\_on\\_employee\\_performance](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284732729_The_impact_of_teamwork_on_employee_performance).
- Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3), 251–269. Doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x.
- Briner, R. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (2011). Evidence-based I-O psychology: Not there yet. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 4(1), 3–22.
- Burke, C. S., Sims, D. E., Lazzara, E. H., & Salas, E. (2007). Trust in leadership: A multi-level review and integration. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18(6), 606–632.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Caillier, J. G. (2014). Toward a better understanding of the relationship between transformational leadership, public service motivation, mission valence, and employee performance: A preliminary study. *Public Personnel Management* 43, 218–239.
- Chiung-Hui, H. (2016). Shared leadership advances task performance? The roles of work attitude. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behavior and Decision Sciences (IJRAOB)*, 2(1), 410-420.
- Conger, J. A., & Pearce, C. L. (2003). A landscape of opportunities: Future research in shared leadership. In: C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 285–303). SAGE Publications Inc.
- Connelly, S., & Gooty, J. (2015). Leading with emotion: An overview of the special issue on leadership and emotions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(4), 485–488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.07.002>.
- Davidson, C. M. (2005). The United Arab Emirates: A study in rapid development. *Middle East Journal*, 59(4), 593–612.
- De Andrade, M. L., Stedefeldt, E., Zanin, L. M., Zanetta, L. D., & Da Cunha, D. T. (2021). Unveiling the food safety climate's paths to adequate food handling in the hospitality industry in Brazil. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33, 873–892. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2020-1030>.
- Dinwoodie, D., Pasmore, W., Quinn, L., & Rabin, R. (2015). *Navigating change: A leader's role*. North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Roloff, K. S. (2009). *Eight Ways to Build Collaborative Teams*. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2009/11/eight-ways-to-build-collaborative-teams>
- Ghasabeh, S. Y., & Provitera, M. J. (2017). Transformational leadership: Building an effective culture to manage organizational knowledge. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 10(2), 1–19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22543/0733.102.1187>.

- Han, S. J., Lee, Y., Beyerlein, M., & Kolb, J. (2018). Shared leadership in teams: The role of coordination, goal commitment, and knowledge sharing on perceived team performance. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 24(3/4), 150–168. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-11-2016-0050>.
- Hoegl, M., & Gemuenden, H. G. (2001). Teamwork quality and the success of innovative projects: A theoretical concept and empirical evidence. *Organization Science*, 12(4), 435–449.
- Junker, N. M., & van Dick, R. (2014). Implicit theories in organizational settings: A systematic review and research agenda of implicit leadership and followership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(6), 1154–1173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.09.002>.
- Khalifa, G. S. A. (2018). The Egyptian Hotels, Where in the Competitive Environment? Competitive Strategies and Market Orientation and its Impact on Customer Loyalty: The Mediating Role of Operational Performance. *International Journal of Management and Human Science (IJMHS)*, 2(4), 60–72.
- Kim, H., Im, J., & Shin, Y. H. (2021). The impact of transformational leadership and commitment to change on restaurant employees' quality of work life during a crisis. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 48, 322–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.07.010>.
- Liu, S., Hu, J., Li, Y., Wang, Z., & Lin, X. (2014). Examining the cross-level relationship between shared leadership and learning in teams: Evidence from China. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 282–295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.08.006>.
- Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 434–451.
- Machogu, O. (2013). *The relationship between leadership styles and organizational performance: The case of selected MSEs from the Kasarani constituency*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Mercurio, Z. A. (2015). Affective commitment as a core essence of organizational commitment an integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(4), 389–414.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538.
- Oc, B., & Bashshur, R. M. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), 919–934. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.006.
- Odumeru, J. A., & Ogbonna, I. G. (2013). Transformational vs. transactional leadership theories: Evidence in literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2(2), 255–262.
- Paukkuri, E. (2015). *How is the phenomenon of shared leadership understood in the theory and practice of school leadership? A case study conducted in four European schools*. Retrieved from <http://tampub.uta.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/96778/978-951-44-9740-7.pdf;sequence=1>.
- Pickeral, T., Evans, L., Hughes, W., & Hutchison, D. (2009). *School climate guide for district policymakers and educational leaders*. New York, NY: Center for Social and emotional Education. Retrieved from

<https://www.schoolclimate.org/themes/schoolclimate/assets/pdf/policy/district-guide-csee.pdf>.

- Reiter-Palmon, R., Wigert, B., & de Vreede, T. (2011). Team creativity and innovation: The effect of group composition, social processes, and cognition. In: M. Mumford (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Creativity* (pp. 295–326). Academic Press.
- Sohmen, S. V. (2013). Leadership and teamwork: two sides of the same coin. *Journal of IT and Economic Development* 4(2), 1–18. doi:10.13140/RG.2.1.4241.7766.
- Taha, S., Zanin, L.M., & Osaili, T.M. (2023). Studying the perception of leadership styles and food handlers' hygienic practices in food businesses: The role of commitment and job satisfaction as Mediators. *Food Control*, 157, 110148. doi:10.1016/j.foodcont.2023.110148.
- Taha, S., Wilkins, S., Juusola, K., & Osaili, T. M. (2020a). Food safety performance in food manufacturing Facilities: The influence of management practices on food handler commitment. *Journal of Food Protection*, 83(1), 60–67.
- Thiel, C. E., Connelly, S., & Griffith, J. A. (2012). Leadership and emotion management for complex tasks: Different emotions, different strategies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(3), 517–533. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.12.005.
- Tough, P. (2012). *How children succeed: Grit, curiosity, and the hidden power of character*. New York: Wiley.
- Trammell, J. M. (2016). *The relationship between distributed leadership and teacher affective commitment in public and private schools*. Jefferson City, TN: Carson-Newman University.
- Ullah, S. M., & Park, D. S. (2013). *Shared Leadership and Team Effectiveness: Moderating Effects of Task Interdependence*. South Korea: Yeungnam University.
- Varadarajan, R., Chandrasekaran, M., & Patterson, P. (2018). An empirical study of shared leadership in the UAE: Focusing on the human resource aspect. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17(6), 285–300
- Waldman, D. A., Wang, Z., & Zhang, Z. (2016). Shared leadership and team performance: The moderating effects of demographic faultlines. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 2016(1), 12358–12363.
- Wang, L., Jiang, W., Liu, Z., & Ma, X. (2017). Shared leadership and team effectiveness: The examination of LMX differentiation and servant leadership on the emergence and consequences of shared leadership. *Human Performance*, 30(4), 1–14. Doi: 10.1080/08959285.2017.1345909.
- Weiss, M., Razinskas, S., Backmann, J., & Hoegl, M. (2018). Authentic leadership and leaders' mental well-being: An experience sampling study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(2), 309–321. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.05.007.
- Whetten, D. A. & Cameron, K. S. (2011). *Developing management skills*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall/Pearson.
- Zincirkiran, M., Emhan, A., & Yasar, F. (2015). Analysis of teamwork, organizational Commitment and organizational performance: A study of the health sector in Turkey. *Asian Journal of Business and Management*, 3(2), 173–182.



