



INSTITUTO
UNIVERSITÁRIO
DE LISBOA

**TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AS AN AGENT FOR
EMPLOYEE AUTONOMY: IMPLICATIONS ON EFFICIENCY, COST
SAVINGS AND THE REDUCTION OF UNPRODUCTIVE WORK TIME**

Bárbara Roda Marques Pascoal

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the conferral of Master's in
Business Administration

Supervisor:

Prof. Álvaro Dias, Invited Professor, Department of Marketing, Strategy and
Operations, ISCTE-IUL

October 2020



**BUSINESS
SCHOOL**

Department of Marketing, Strategy and Operations

**TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AS AN AGENT FOR
EMPLOYEE AUTONOMY: IMPLICATIONS ON EFFICIENCY, COST
SAVINGS AND THE REDUCTION OF UNPRODUCTIVE WORK TIME**

Bárbara Roda Marques Pascoal

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the conferral of Master's in
Business Administration

Supervisor:

Prof. Álvaro Dias, Invited Professor, Department of Marketing, Strategy and
Operations, ISCTE-IUL

October 2020

Acknowledgement

To Rafaela Pereira, without her motivation, help, knowledge and friendship, it would be impossible to finish this dissertation.

To my Advisor, Álvaro Dias, who simplified the whole process, answered all my questions, guided me and keep me on track.

To my Mother, who puts pressure on me by being the most successful manager, allowed me to continue studying, allows me to follow my wildest dreams, always has a joke to make me laugh and is always there.

To my Father, who doesn't let me forget my goals, allowed me to continue studying, gives me the best advice, inspires me to always want more and is always there.

To Emanuel Lima, who has been my family all my life, has treated me like a daughter, put up with me at my worst and always gave me his best, and is always there.

To Filipa Coelho, for being the true meaning of best friend, being my safety net and for being the one I can't live without.

To André Rego, for the unconditional love, the unconditional support, for making me want a better future.

The last acknowledgement is to every person that answered my questionnaire, allowing me to complete my research.

Abstract

Today's companies are characterized by the variables within and how those variables combine. The business environment faces a competitive economic context and companies must be aware of what drives results up and how to motivate those who are responsible for that. The performance of a company is affected by several variables and understanding them and knowing how they work is decisive for management.

Therefore, this research aims to address and measure how Transformational Leadership impacts the employees work, in the matter of autonomy, efficiency, cost savings and the reduction of unproductive work time. That is accomplished through formulation and testing of four research hypotheses. For that purpose, we applied a questionnaire, preceded by a pre-test procedure, to a sample composed by employees or former employees of companies on various sectors, receiving a total of 174 valid answers.

Our results reveal that leaders who adopt a Transformational approach allow workers to be more autonomous in their work, the autonomy leverage the existence of efficiency in tasks and processes. Efficiency is also transmitted by cost savings, which translates into a reduction of unproductive work time. Also, the mediator effect of Efficiency and Employee Autonomy on the relation between transformational leadership and cost savings and between transformational leadership and unproductive work time, adds notoriety to Efficiency and Employee Autonomy itself, since it allows the increasing importance of both variables to achieve higher results.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Employee Autonomy, Efficiency, Cost Savings, Unproductive Work Time

JEL Classification System:

M10 – Business Administration: General

M14 – Business Administration: Corporate Culture; Diversity; Social Responsibility

Resumo

Na atualidade, as empresas são caracterizadas pelas variáveis internas e de que forma essas variáveis trabalham juntas. O mundo dos negócios enfrenta um contexto económico competitivo e as empresas precisam de estar atentas ao que impulsiona os resultados e como motivar os responsáveis. O desempenho de uma empresa é delineado por diversas variáveis, entendê-las e saber como funcionam é decisivo para a gestão.

Nesse sentido, esta pesquisa tem como objetivo abordar e perceber como a Liderança Transformacional impacta o trabalho dos colaboradores, no que se refere à autonomia, eficiência, redução de custos e redução do tempo de trabalho improdutivo. Esta investigação foi realizada através da formulação de quatro hipóteses de pesquisa. Para o efeito, aplicou-se um questionário, precedido de um pré-teste, a uma amostra composta por colaboradores ou ex-colaboradores de empresas que operam em vários sectores, obtendo-se um total de 174 respostas válidas.

Os resultados evidenciaram que os líderes que adotam uma abordagem Transformacional permitem que os trabalhadores sejam autónomos no seu trabalho, a autonomia potencializa a existência de eficiência nas tarefas e processos. A eficiência também é transmitida pela redução de custos, o que se traduz numa redução do tempo de trabalho improdutivo. Além disso, o efeito mediador da Eficiência e Autonomia na relação entre a liderança transformacional e a redução de custos e entre a liderança transformacional e a redução do tempo de trabalho improdutivo, acrescenta notoriedade à própria Eficiência e Autonomia, uma vez que permite o aumento da importância de ambas as variáveis para alcançar melhores resultados.

Palavras-chave: Liderança Transformacional, Autonomia, Eficiência, Redução de Custos, Tempo de Trabalho Improdutivo.

JEL Classification System:

M10 – Business Administration: General

M14 – Business Administration: Corporate Culture; Diversity; Social Responsibility

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
Objectives	2
2. Literature Review	3
2.1.Key Concepts	3
2.1.1. Transformational Leadership	3
2.1.2. Employee Autonomy	4
2.1.3. Efficiency	6
2.1.4. Cost Savings	8
2.1.5. Unproductive Work Time	11
3. Hypthesis Development	13
3.1.Transformational Leadership and Employee Autonomy	13
3.2.Transformational Leadership and Efficiency	14
3.3.Transformational Leadership and Cost Savings	15
3.4.Transformational Leadership and Unproductive Work Time	15
4. Methodology	17
4.1.Data collection and sample	17
4.2.Instruments and variables	19
4.3.Results	20
4.4.Quantitative Results	21
5. Discussion	24
6. Conclusion	26
6.1.Theoretical contributions	26
6.2.Managerial implications	27
6.3.Research limitations and future research	28
References	29
Appendix	33

List of Tables

Table 1	4
Table 2	5
Table 3	8
Table 4	20
Table 5	22
Table 6	22

1. Introduction

Transformational Leadership is the center of multiple investigations, for its relevance in companies and all types of associations, for attempting to match the needs of followers to the goals and objectives of the leaders (Bass et al., 1987). Research tell us that transformational leadership allows companies to create employees more motivated, more aligned with the company, in line with the strategies that benefits the company and impacts the employee's ability of being autonomous, in their work.

The professional implications of using a Transformational Leadership approaches could result in more capable and autonomous employees resulting in greater results. The social implications also reflect a higher importance, regarding the ongoing developing capabilities of the employees who want to gain more responsibilities and achieve superior positions within the company.

According to Hardré and Reeve (2009:167), "little attention to date has been given to actual interventions to promote autonomy-supportive style of managers, using the framework of self-determination theory", which indicates that leaders aren't aware of the advantages that having a transformational approach can have on the outcome of their employees. Losing opportunities to increase efficiency, cost savings and reducing unproductive work time, a cause for distraction ate the workplace.

The goal of this dissertation is to understand how Transformational leadership reveals the importance of having a autonomy supportive style of management and assuming the autonomy of workers, the objective is to understand how that relates to the increase of efficiency in the processes of the company, which means cost savings, reducing unproductive work time and, overall, an increased productivity.

The research conducted in this dissertation shows that is important for leaders to understand the advantages of having a transformational approach, since it has a direct positive effect in employee autonomy and in the increase of efficiency. The research also indicates the importance of indirect effects and the mediator effect of efficiency and employee autonomy, revealing that cost savings and unproductive work time can be achieved by assuring the increasing of efficiency and employee autonomy in processes and instill it in employees.

Objectives

The main purpose of this investigation is to identify the impact of Transformational Leadership in the four dependent variables. To complete this dissertation, the following objectives must be met:

- . Understand what Transformational Leadership is;
- . Understand how Transformational Leadership impacts Employee Autonomy;
- . Understand how Transformational Leadership impacts Efficiency;
- . Understand how Transformational Leadership impacts Cost Savings;
- . Understand how Transformational Leadership impacts Unproductive Work Time;

2. Literature Review

2.1. Key Concepts

2.1.1. Transformational Leadership

Leadership is viewed as a critical element in the success or failure of organizations, and substantial progress has been made to theorize the different perspectives. Transformational leaders are those who inspire and motivate followers to both achieve extraordinary outcomes and, in the process, develop their own leadership capability. Transformational leadership empowers the followers, the leaders and the organizations by helping them grow and develop whilst aligning the objectives from both sides (Bass et al., 1987).

Transformational leaders have the unique ability to change beliefs, needs and values by creating a mutual stimulation that can convert followers into leaders. Transforming leaders function based on a strong value system, which is referred as *end values*. *End values* indicate those values (i.e. integrity, honor, justice) that can't be negotiated or exchanged, ultimately letting transformational leaders change followers' goals and beliefs, achieving higher levels of performance and pursuing goals that usually they wouldn't pursue. Some authors believe that charismatic leaders are an essential part of transformational leaders, as they are capable of "having a profound and extraordinary effect on followers" (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

Additional studies about this leadership perspective added four, essential, elements to better understand the characteristics of Transformational Leadership. Idealized influence is what resembles with a charismatic role model. Involving behaviors such as sacrificing for the benefit of the group and setting an example which proves high ethical standards. Inspirational motivation is the capability of inspiring followers by using clear and engaging communication to present a vision of the future that indicates optimism and enthusiasm. Intellectual stimulation is about inspiring followers to foster innovation and change the status quo, which results in a different view of the problems and a new awareness of the environment. Individual consideration is the supporting of the individual needs of followers, by encouragement and coaching focusing more on their development (Kark et al., 2003).

Transformational leaders plan the future and act oriented to that, are "open-minded, dynamic, and concerned about planning" (Jaskyte, 2004:155). The employee commitment to the company is altered by transforming their mission and vision and it is expected, from employees, that experience TFL, "to think beyond themselves and to become high performers and leaders themselves" (Jaskyte, 2004:155).

TFL can be defined by practices such as “challenge familiar organizational processes, inspire a shared vision among employees, enable employees to act in accordance with their vision, model the way for employees to perform, and encourage employees through recognition and celebration of success” (Jaskyte, 2004:156).

Theorists	Definition
(Bass et al., 1987:74)	“(…) transformational leader attempts to elevate the needs of the follower in line with the leader’s own goals and objectives. (…) As a consequence of being intellectually stimulated by their leader, followers develop their own capabilities to solve future problems that the leader may not have anticipated. Followers learn to tackle and solve problems on their own.”
(Jaskyte, 2004:155)	“Transformational leaders are future oriented, open-minded, dynamic, and concerned about planning. They renew employee commitment to the organization by redefining organizational mission and vision.”
(Judge & Bono, 2000:751)	“(…) transformational leaders, who obtain support by inspiring followers to identify with a vision that reaches beyond their own immediate self-interests (…)”
(Kark et al., 2003:247)	“(…) transformational leadership behaviors comprise four components: inspirational motivation, idealized influence, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation.”
(Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987:648)	“Transformational leadership is based on more than the compliance of followers; it involves shifts in the beliefs, the needs, and the values of followers. (…) transformational leaders attempt and succeed in raising colleagues, subordinates, followers, clients, or constituencies to a greater awareness about the issues of consequence.”

Table 1. Transformational Leadership definitions

2.1.2. Employee Autonomy

Employee autonomy derives from employee motivation, that’s why its complex and challenging and gains from both definitions, increasing productivity and a positive workplace climate. The managers leadership facilitates motivation and supports autonomous performance which is in line with substantial empirical studies that has been validating the beneficial effects of autonomy-supportive management style and the employee’s motivation regarding their job and work performance (Hardré & Reeve, 2009).

Leaders are often hesitant on how they motivate employees in order to promote high quality work and for that exist managerial strategies, also to control the limits of what can motivate and what can undermine those objectives. Becoming less controlling and more autonomy supportive are the two key elements that shape this mindset, while less controlling means learning to avoid pressuring language and more autonomy means learning to take the other perspective, become mindful of their motivational sources and nurturing inner motivational resources, while providing explanatory and rational information (Hardré & Reeve, 2009).

Autonomy can be conceptualized in terms of the degree to which an individual is able to determine his own work processes, to pace himself, to have control over work agendas and to have some say over goal setting. Further theories view autonomy as the awareness of self-determination with regards to work processes, goals and priorities (Breugh, 1985).

Proactive employees adopt and internalize organizational values and goals, holding it with strong emotional connotations which reflects the conceptualization of exemplary employees. Companies consider job competency, interpersonal effectiveness and organizational orientation important characteristics, knowing that attentive employees often bring the vision with them, matching personal values to organizational values. This new demand from employees creates a paradox, since job descriptions are unlikely to predict all the potential work situations an employee might face, managers need employees who will use their own judgment when they face out-of-the-ordinary circumstances. Companies need employees who show initiative and judgment, expecting them to think and act like their bosses (Campbell, 2000).

Theorists	Definition
(Campbell, 2000:54)	“(...) proactive employees adopt and internalize organizational values and goals, and hold these values and goals with strong emotional overtones. The notion that proactive employees have a value-imbued vision of the organization is also reflected in Kelley's conceptualization of exemplary employees, with the qualification that focused individuals often bring the vision with them, matching personal values to organizational values. “
(Breugh, 1985:552)	“(...) autonomy has been linked to such important variables as employee performance, work satisfaction, job involvement, absenteeism, and satisfaction with supervision.”

(Hardré & Reeve, 2009:167) “Diagnosing and supporting employees’ motivation is complex and challenging but it is well worth the effort in terms of potential gains in both productivity and workplace climate.”

Table 2. Autonomy definitions

2.1.3. Efficiency

In the most general definition, efficiency is the relationship between benefits and costs. When talking about efficiency inside a company “the central competitive dimension of what firms know how to do is to create and transfer knowledge efficiently within an organizational context” (Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010:1521). This transfer, although its essential, it occurs with costs, opportunity costs of efforts and the time spent by the knowledge provider to find out what knowledge is useful to the receiver, sometimes needing to adapt and/or translate in order to be received in a successful way (Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010).

In a cross-functional and interdisciplinary work environment the displaying of revolutionary innovations is imminent, although its vital to overcome interpretive barriers, by transmitting know how through “coding schemes” and “conceptual frameworks” (Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010:1521).

Organizational efficiency is how well a firm maximizes output from the resources it uses. Core employees have a positive effect in organizational efficiency, by developing their capabilities and improving the internal processes, making them rare and inimitable, outperforming competitors. Those core employees are expected to over achieve and become more efficient as they develop their know how, being an advantage for the company since personal skills and personal capabilities are difficult to duplicate, meaning a competitive advantage over others (Lopez-Cabrales et al., 2006).

Efficiency in scientific management is reducing wastage of labour and materials, increasing the overall output. Efficient organization must be established before individual processes can be made efficient which can be achieved by the following 12 principles (Witzel, 2002).

- . Clearly defined ideals – the organization must know what its goals are, what it stands for and its relationship with society;
- . Common sense – the organization must be practical and flexible in its methods and position;
- . Competent counsel – the organization should seek wise advice, turning to external experts if it lacks the necessary staff expertise;

- . Discipline – not so much top-down discipline as internal discipline and self-discipline, with workers conforming willingly and readily to the systems in place;
- . The fair deal – workers should be treated fairly at all times to encourage their participation in the efficiency movement;
- . Reliable, immediate and adequate records – measurement over time is important in determining if efficiency has been achieved;
- . Despatching – workflow must be scheduled in such a way that processes move smoothly;
- . Standards and schedules – the establishment of these is fundamental to the achievement of efficiency;
- . Standardized conditions – workplace conditions should be standardized according to natural scientific principles and should evolve as new knowledge becomes available;
- . Standardized operations – operations should follow scientific principles, particularly in terms of planning and work methods;
- . Written instructions – all standards should be recorded in the form of written instructions to workers, which detail not only the standards themselves but the methods of compliance;
- . Efficiency reward – if workers achieve efficiency, then they should be duly rewarded by bonuses for meeting overall targets.

Employee engagement is defined as the level of commitment and connection an employee has with their organization and its values. The engagement brings out the sense of responsibility towards the business goals, creating a positive attitude in the workplace and a positive emotional connection that makes the employees go beyond their goals to perform their role in excellence (Jagannathan, 2014).

Engaged employees can be defined by the following six management traits (Jagannathan, 2014):

- . Job content: autonomy, challenging opportunities for learning;
- . Compensation/Monetary Benefits: attractive salary matching the education, experience and responsibilities, adequate compensation for the work and intra-organization parity;
- . Work-Life Balance: having appreciation for personal needs, able to spend time with family;
- . Top-Management Employee Relations: accessibility of top management, their values and ethical conduct, equality in treatment, respecting the views of subordinates, providing an environment of co-working;

- . Scope for Advancement and Career Growth: well-made policy, acceptable opportunities for career growth and advancement, clearly laid down career growth paths, implementation of the promotion policy in a transparent and fair manner, help the employees in achieving growth;
- . Team Orientation/Team Work: importance, cooperation in inter and intra-department teams.

Theorists	Definition
(Fliaster & Schloderer, 2010:1521)	“(...) the central competitive dimension of what firms know how to do is to create and transfer knowledge efficiently within an organizational context.”
(Lopez-Cabrales et al., 2006:87)	“It is reasonable to expect a positive linkage between development of capabilities and efficiency, because firms with well-established internal processes that are valuable, rare, and inimitable will outperform the rest.”
(Witzel, 2002)	“Most of our current ideas about efficiency are based on the concept of “process efficiency”, the idea that by making each individual process efficient we will then end up with an efficient organisation overall.”

Table 3. Efficiency definitions

2.1.4. Cost Savings

Steven Bragg, in his book, described several tools, based on various types of financial and operational analysis, for achieving cost reduction (or cost savings) within a company (Bragg, 2010).

The 5S Analysis – This methodical process works as a way to organize, order, clean, standardize and continuously improve a work area. 5S is one of the efficiently working tools of Lean Manufacturing. The program gets its name from five Japanese words: Seiri, Seiton, Seiso, Seiketsu and Shitsuke, which when translated mean Sort, Set in Order, Shining, Standardize and Sustain, respectively. This philosophy is creating and sustaining a well-organized workplace that is more efficient and productive in operation (Jaca et al., 2014):

- . Sort – review all of the items within a work are, retain those needed for daily operations, and dispose of all other items.

- . Straighten – relocate furniture and equipment to better serve the process flow and move all other objects out of the way.
- . Scrub – clean the area completely.
- . Systematize – establish schedules for repetitively cleaning the area.
- . Standardize – incorporate the 5S system into standard company operations, so that it is performed on an ongoing basis. This should include a formal organization for monitoring the results of the program.

Benchmarking – This method is a measurement process that results in comparative performance measure. It describes how extraordinary performance is accomplished by identifying the measures of performance indicators, which are called benchmarks and the activities that facilitate the exceptional performance, called enablers. Enablers explain the motives for the superior performance; thus benchmarking studies are conducted with the support of the two components. Which means that benchmarks can be achieved by reaching the enablers.

Benchmarking is about connecting processes, practices or procedures. Processes may be compared inside an organization against internal processes or against competitors. The types of benchmarking reflect what is compared, involving comparisons of performance, process and strategic benchmarking; and what the comparison is being made against, involving internal, competitive, functional and generic comparisons (Ajelabi & Tang, 2010)

Breakeven analysis – This method consists in the idea that a product line may generate such minimal throughput (revenue minus total variable expenses) that it cannot pay for the cost of the overhead that is straightly linked to it, except it produces at near-maximum capacity levels. Run a breakeven analysis on company processes to see where this problem arises and target cost reductions in those areas, where product lines are at risk of not exceeding their breakeven levels (Bragg, 2010).

Check sheets – This technique is a controlled form used for the collection and analysis of data. Its most common application is for the assembly of data about the regularity or patterns of events. Data entry on the form is designed to be as simple as possible, with check marks or similar symbols. The check sheet is used most frequently in a production setting but can be easily applied anywhere in a company (Bragg, 2010).

Employee idea systems – This strategy originates a theoretically infinite number of smaller cost reduction possibilities. The best way to obtain these smaller cost reductions is to create an employee idea collection system where a company actively solicits ideas from its employees,

gathering dozen ideas per year and to implement most of the suggestions. Installing hundreds or thousands of cost reduction ideas is also a significant way to build up a competitive position in an industry because small ideas are much less visible to competitors, which means they are less likely to be copied. There is a great intrinsic value to an employee to see a suggestion implemented, so it is important to have a good implementation system in place. Implementation should be handled as soon as possible by front-line staff, not routed up through the corporate chain of command for approval. If management requires multiple approvals for each idea, there is more chance that it will be reject somewhere, which tends to discourage employees from making further suggestions. Also, an extended approval process takes more time, money and paperwork. A concern with employee idea systems is that they are very difficult to plan for, since cannot be quantified where or when cost reductions will be made or the amount of savings. However, if ideas are generated and implemented in large numbers, a company can generally estimate the amount of savings that may be generated, based on historical results (Bragg, 2010).

Error quantification – This method is based in the assumption that any error that results in a scrapped or reworked product or documents piles up costs. A company can create an information tracking system to aggregate error information, which is then summarized into a report. The report notes the number of occurrences of an error during the measurement period. It also notes the lost throughput of each item. If an item is eliminated, then the associated throughput is lost forever. If an item is redone, then the cost of rework labor is offset against the lost throughput to yield a reduced level of throughput. Further, the report indicates the time and labor cost required for rework (Bragg, 2010).

Value stream mapping – This methodology is an important tool of the lean approach and is used to recognize value-adding activities and what is considered wasteful of materials, information and people. The objectives of VSM are to observe material flow in real time from the final customer to the raw material stage and to identify losses in the process. The benefits of this approach are allowing a broad view of the entire flow; helping to identify waste; showing the relationship between material and information flow; providing a simple and standardized way to treat procedures; making decisions more “visible,” allowing previous discussion of possible changes and improvements and; forming the basis for an action plan. Managing the value stream involves a process of understanding, measuring, and improving the flow of materials and information and the communications of all tasks, to keep a company’s costs, services, and quality products as competitive as possible (William & Fazleena, 2014).

Waste analysis – Assessing cost reduction can be accomplished simply by identifying the various types of waste and then working to reduce them. The author identifies seven types of waste (Bragg, 2010):

- . Additional processing – this is any production process that does not directly add value to a product, such as a quality control review.
- . Defects – any processing that destroys or harms production that has already passed through the bottleneck operation is a form of waste, because it eliminates valuable throughput and may require additional expenditures for rework.
- . Inventory – inventory of all types entails a working capital investment, storage costs, and is at risk of becoming obsolete. It also hides other cost, such as production disparities and poor work practices.
- . Motion – any motion by employees that does not add value is a waste, which includes any equipment setup time.
- . Overproduction – any production beyond specific customer orders is a waste, because it uses materials and other resources, which then translates into storage costs and are subject to obsolescence.
- . Transportation – any movement of materials between any operations that transform the materials, such as between workstations in a production process. If something is moved several times, more the opportunity to damage materials.
- . Waiting – any time when a machine or its operator is waiting is considered a waste of that resource. Waiting can be caused by unbalanced work capacity, overstaffing and materials shortage.

2.1.5. Unproductive Work Time

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, unproductive is defined as not producing very much and/or not producing positive results, while Infopedia defined as unprofitable and useless. Unproductive and non-productive mean different forms of not being productive, either is from not doing nothing at all or doing something that's not productive.

Nonproductive hours include vacation, sick time, holiday pay, and other hours paid to employees while they are not engaged in their normal work. In some situations, break and lunch time may be carefully monitored to guard against the abuse of nonproductive work time. Sick

leave is often monitored because absenteeism, and excessive use of sick leave is costly and reduces staff productivity (Langabeer II & Helton, 2016).

Is estimated that vacations, holidays, sick leave and other sources of paid nonproductive time total about 350 hours per year, for an estimated 17% of nonproductive hours to total paid hours. Nonproductive hours for any additional required training, such as to meet regulatory requirements, can push the paid nonproductive percent into the range of 20% to 25% of all paid hours (Waxman, 2013).

3. Hypothesis Development

In line with the topic of this research, which aims to establish a positive scientific relationship between transformational leadership and employee autonomy, efficiency, cost savings and the reduction of unproductive work time, it is crucial to address the importance of our hypothesis. In order to validate this research, we need first to evaluate the validity of the four proposed hypotheses, which are properly described and consequently theoretically framed in order to address its academic validity and relevance.

3.1. Transformational Leadership and Employee Autonomy

Transforming leaders function based on a strong value system, based on integrity, honor, and justice. To a leader these values can't be negotiated or exchanged, which is passed on the followers', that ultimately achieve higher levels of performance and pursue goals that usually they wouldn't pursue (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). The managers leadership facilitates motivation and supports autonomous performance which is in line with substantial empirical studies that has been validating the beneficial effects of autonomy-supportive management style and the employee's motivation regarding their job and work performance (Hardré & Reeve, 2009). Proactive employees adopt and internalize organizational values and goals, holding it with strong emotional connotations which reflects the conceptualization of exemplary employees (Campbell, 2000).

Autonomy stimulates self-determination in employees, as they can choose alternative ways to approach tasks, experience more ownership, and have a more direct influence on results. This increases their willingness to take responsibility and to persist despite obstacles. Research indeed confirms employees are generally more proactive when they have more autonomy and transformational leaders can directly inspire proactive behavior by developing and empowering employees by motivating them intellectually.

Transformational leaders share an attractive and challenging vision of the future and have high performance expectations, by infusing work with meaning, stimulating followers intellectually, and inspiring them to exceed self-interests. Transformational leaders are more change oriented and proactive themselves, acting as role-models of proactive behavior. Leaders can also indirectly increase proactive behavior, for example, by stimulating positive emotions. Research shows that transformational leaders develop positive affect and affective

commitment. Both affect and commitment relate positively to proactive behavior (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012).

Thus, we hypothesize:

H1. Transformational leadership positively relates with the degree of employee autonomy.

3.2. Transformational Leadership and Efficiency

Organizational efficiency is how well a firm maximizes output from the resources it uses. Core employees have a positive effect in organizational efficiency, by developing their capabilities and improving the internal processes, making them rare and inimitable, outperforming competitors. Those core employees are expected to overachieve and become more efficient as they develop their know how, being an advantage for the company since personal skills and personal capabilities are difficult to duplicate, meaning a competitive advantage over others (Lopez-Cabrales et al., 2006).

Efficiency pressures are relevant to attitudes about collaboration and could also provide a framework against which transformational leadership is interpreted as a call for collaborative solutions. The degree to which compensation and rewards are linked to the execution of individual tasks may negatively correlate with how attractive collaboration will appear. Performance-based rewards are known to shape the impact of transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership can be defined by practices such as “challenge familiar organizational processes, inspire a shared vision among employees, enable employees to act in accordance with their vision, model the way for employees to perform, and encourage employees through recognition and celebration of success” (Jaskyte, 2004:156).

An emphasis on internal efficiency can produce conflict between job demands and resources, which innovative behaviors may lighten. Cost reduction, eliminating unnecessary functions, and the general need to “do more with less” can drive organizations to embrace alternative paths to goal achievement. Collaboration allows organizations to access external resources, and the organization’s emphasis on efficiency may make collaborative initiatives more attractive to its employees (Campbell, 2000).

The transformational leader encourages the adoption of new values, new beliefs and supports the goal for organizational effectiveness through effective communication, persuasion and confidence building (Lebrasseur et al., 2002).

Thus, we hypothesize:

H2. Transformational leadership positively relates with the degree of efficiency.

3.3. Transformational Leadership and Cost Savings

According to studies, a top-down approach where the CEO exhibits transformational leadership aligns the organization's strategy, structure, and culture. Under this leadership the stakeholder goals of quality and cost savings are coordinated. The members of the organization start both a cognitive and behavioural adjustment centred on teamwork, facilitated by training and education.

“The effective leader exhibits charisma (envisioning, energizing, and enabling) and creates instrumentality (structuring, controlling, and rewarding) to ensure organizational re-orientation” (Lebrasseur et al., 2002:147). Under the transformational leadership a planned collective effort develops to change the assumptions, values and beliefs about the organization, its goals and methods of operating. There is the adherence to the goal of quality and the goal of cost savings by the members of the team. Senior management initiative and commitment, under the transformational leadership is essential to build and maintain an overall organizational effectiveness (Lebrasseur et al., 2002).

Thus, we hypothesize:

H3. Transformational leadership positively relates with the degree of cost savings.

H4. Efficiency mediates the positive relation between transformational leadership and cost savings.

H5. Employee autonomy mediates the positive relation between transformational leadership and cost savings.

3.4. Transformational Leadership and Unproductive Work Time

Transformational leaders are defined as someone who can act proactive, raise followers' awareness for collective interests and help them to accomplish goals above what are expected. This leadership creates the awareness of a sharing common goal and a shared identity, reducing flawed processes and associated preconceptions. Which means transformational leadership acts in consolidation of teams, by gathering them around an unique goal which reduces not productive results (Kunze & Bruch, 2010).

Studies found empirical support for the positive relation between transformational leadership and team cohesiveness through collective identification, which is align with a decrease intergroup conflict that is supported by the assignment of a subordinated goal. It is very common that in teams with high perceived transformational leadership, all dimensions of teams' productive energy will increase. Transformational leadership allow productivity and performance beyond expectation for individuals and for teams (Kunze & Bruch, 2010).

Thus, we hypothesize:

H6. Transformational leadership negatively relates with the degree of unproductive work time.

H7. Efficiency mediates the negative relation between transformational leadership and unproductive work time

H8. Employee autonomy mediates the negative relation between transformational leadership and unproductive work time

4. Methodology

4.1. Data collection and sample

The most used instrument for quantitative data gathering is the application of a questionnaire (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003). We used a non-probabilistic sample more specifically a convenience sampling, since the questionnaire was distributed through its publication and publicization in social networks and through dissemination to the professionals of an International company. The questionnaires were built up and answered on Google Forms platform.

The target population for the quantitative study was any person who work or had worked in Portugal, as the answers were to be based in a Portuguese professional experience. The questionnaire was anonymous and made available in Portuguese language, once it is the mainly used language of the respondents. The questionnaire may be consulted in the Appendix.

Before making the questionnaire available we conducted a pre-test validation, as it is the recommended procedure to discover format or content errors (Cooper & Schindler, 2013), guaranteeing that the final questionnaire is the best possible version of itself (Nichols & Hunter Childs, 2009). We applied the purposed questionnaire to a sample of 6 participants, all of them with different age range and a different academic and professional background. The pre-test was sent by e-mail, carried out in two day and resulted mostly in adaptations of the statements in order to better understand what was being asked. Which resulted in the following adaptations:

- Respondents advised that the statement “In the company where I work, employees have the opportunity to participate in increasing organizational efficiency” was not clear about what was participating in organizational efficiency and the statement was changed to “In the company where I work, employees have the opportunity to create administrative and / or technical solutions that increase the efficiency of the processes ”;
- Respondents advised that the statement “In the company where I work, the management of resources (human, material, monetary, among others) is done sensibly” should be divided into three different statements, because the companies may not have the same exactly management in the three dimensions;
- Respondents advised that the statement “My Boss/Leader gives positive and negative feedback to employees” should also be divided, in this case in two sentences, because some leaders may only give one type of feedback;

- Respondents advised that in the statement “In the company where I work they monitor all mistakes made to solve and gradually stop happening” the word “all” (= all) should be removed because may not be realistic for a company to be capable to monitor all errors;
- Respondents advised that the statement “In the company where I work they make assessments to understand which processes can be optimized in order to reduce costs” was too long and respondents would loose focus, so it was changed to “In the company where I work they assess the processes that can be optimized in order to reduce costs ”;
- Respondents advised that the statement “In the company where I work there is more work to do than employees to do it” was confusing and one respondant gave the idea of the following statement, that end up being on the questionnaire, “In the company where I work there is insufficient human resources ”.

Were received 174 valid responses to the questionnaire and the data collection occurred between August 3 and September 1 and of the respondents, 57,5% were female and 42,5% were male. In terms of age, 56,3% were between 20 and 29 years old, 29,9% were between 30 and 39 years old, 8,6% were between 40 and 49 years old, 4,6% were between 50 and 59 years old, and only one person was older than 60. Regarding the literary abilities, 40,8% had (or was finishing) a Master’s Degree, 29,9% had (or was finishing) a Bachelor’s Degree, 19% had an High School Degree, 8,6% had a Technical Professional Degree, and 1,7% had a Doctorate Degree.

Regarding the Professional Sector, the two areas most represented were the Wholesale and Retail and Financial and Insurance sector, with both 14,9% of the respondents; 13,8% in IT sector; 12,1% in Human Resources; 10,3% in Healthcare and Social Care; 6,3% in Education; 5,2% in Transportation and Logistics; 3,4% in both Construction and Communication and Marketing; 2,9% in both Hospitality, Catering and similar and Military Forces; 2,3% in Manufacturing Industries, Utilities (electricity, gas and water) and Public Workforce; 1,7% in Real Estate and 0,6% in both Extractive Industries and Law. Concerning the job profile, 51,7% are doing Technical jobs; 19% are doing Administrative jobs; 17,2% are in positions of Management; 9,8% are Salespersons and 2,3% are Directors.

Regarding the seniority, the majority of the respondents are working in the company for at least 6 months and up to 2 years; 24,1% are in the company for more than 5 years; 23% are in the company for at least 2 years and up to 5 years; and 14,9% are in the company for less than 6 months.

4.2. Instruments and Variables

The questionnaire followed the same order as the variables in the Literature Review comprising six different groups. It started with the Sociodemographic data, where was asked to describe the academic background and the professional situation. Then the subsequent 5 groups followed the variables of the research: Transformational Leadership, Employee Autonomy, Efficiency, Cost Savings and Unproductive Work time. In total was asked to answer 44 questions.

The Transformational Leader measure was based in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire created by Bass and Avolio (1990) more specifically in the statements regarding Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individual Consideration, the four elements of Transformational Leadership. This group had a total of nine statements.

The Employee Autonomy measure was adopted from two questionnaires, one created by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and the other by Breugh (1985). Sample questions are “My Boss/Leader gives employees the opportunity to think and act independently”, based in the “Desirable Job Characteristics” part of the original questionnaire by Hackman and Oldham (1975), and “My Boss/Leader gives employees the opportunity to complete their tasks in the period that is most convenient for them”, were based in the questionnaire created by Breugh (1985). This group had a total of nine statements.

The Efficiency Group was inspired by the authors present in the literature review in section 1.3. Sample questions are “In the company where I work, the management of human resources is done sensibly”, which were inspired by the research of Witzel (2002), and “In the company where I work, employees have the opportunity to create administrative and/or technical solutions that increase the efficiency of processes”, inspired by Lopez-Cabrales (2006). This group had a total of eight statements.

The Cost Savings Group was inspired by the authors present in the literature review in section 1.4. Sample questions are “In the company where I work they evaluate the processes that can be optimized in order to reduce costs”, inspired by Anand & Kodali (2008) and “In the company where I work, value the ideas of employees when they imply cost reduction” inspired by Bragg (2010). This group had a total of five statements.

The Unproductive Work Time Group was inspired by the authors present in the literature review in section 1.5. Sample questions are “In the company where I work there are many employees enjoying medical leave”, inspired by Waxman (2013) and “In the company where I

work there are many employees who miss work”, inspired by Langabeer II and Helton (2016). This group had a total of seven statements.

All the statements in the questionnaire were evaluated by a odd-numbered Likert scale, which normally are preferred by respondents (Colman et al., 1997), as these are the “most commonly used psychometric scales for examining self-reported perceptions and attitudes” (Ho, 2017:676). Several researchers successfully assessed perceived organizational performance through the usage of a 5-point Likert scale (Ostroff, 1992; Som, 2008), we opted to use a 5-point Likert-scale, ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree).

4.3. Results

In order to test our conceptual model was used structural equation modelling (SEM). More specifically, we use partial least squares (PLS), a variance-based structural equation modelling technique, by means of SmartPLS 3 software (Ringle et al., 2015). The analysis and interpretation of the results followed a two-stage approach, first we evaluated the reliability and validity of the measurement model and then assessed the structural model. To assess the quality of the measurement model, we examined the individual indicators of reliability, convergent validity, internal consistency reliability, and discriminant validity (Hair Jr et al., 2017). The results showed that the standardized factor loadings of all items were above 0.6 (with a minimum value of 0.66) and were all significant at $p < 0.001$, which provided evidence for the individual indicator reliability (Hair Jr et al., 2017). Internal consistency reliability was confirmed because for all constructs Cronbach’s alphas and composite reliability (CR) values surpassed the cut-off of 0.7 (Hair Jr et al., 2017).

Latent Variables	α	CR	AVE	1	2	3	4	5
(1) Transformational Leadership	0,942	0,952	0,715	0,846	0,840	0,630	0,603	0,273
(2) Employee Autonomy	0,917	0,932	0,604	0,833	0,777	0,647	0,707	0,350
(3) Efficiency	0,890	0,914	0,606	0,581	0,598	0,778	0,840	0,461
(4) Cost Savings	0,765	0,865	0,681	0,512	0,598	0,723	0,825	0,477
(5) Unproductive Work Time	0,831	0,868	0,523	0,278	0,341	0,453	0,413	0,723

Table 4. Composite reliability, average variance extracted, correlations, and discriminant validity checks.

Note: α -Cronbach Alpha; CR -Composite reliability; AVE -Average variance extracted. Bolded

numbers are the square roots of AVE. Below the diagonal elements are the correlations between the constructs. Above the diagonal elements are the HTMT ratios.

Convergent validity was also confirmed for three key reasons. First, as noted before all items loaded positively and significantly on their respective constructs. Second, all constructs had CR values higher than 0.7. Third, as Table 4 shows, the average variance extracted (AVE) for all constructs exceeds the threshold of 0.50 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). The discriminant validity was assessed using two approaches. First, we used the Fornell and Larcker criterion. This criterion requires that a construct's square root of AVE (shown on the diagonal with bold values in Table 4) is larger than its biggest correlation with any construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Table 4 shows that this criterion is satisfied for all constructs. Second, we used the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) criterion (Hair Jr et al., 2017; Henseler et al., 2014). As Table 4 shows, all HTMT ratios are below the more conservative threshold value of 0.85 (Hair Jr et al., 2017; Henseler et al., 2014). They provide additional evidence of discriminant validity.

The structural model was assessed using the sign, magnitude, and significance of the structural path coefficients; the magnitude of R² value for each endogenous variable as a measure of the model's predictive accuracy; and the Stone-Geisser's Q² values as a measure of the model's predictive relevance (Hair Jr et al., 2017). However, we checked for collinearity before evaluating the structural model (Hair Jr et al., 2017). The VIF values ranged from 1.00 to 3.27, which was below the indicative critical value of 5 (Hair Jr et al., 2017). These values indicated no collinearity. The coefficient of the determination R² for the four variables Employee Autonomy, Efficiency, Cost Savings and Unproductive Worktime perceived self-efficacy and innovativeness are 69.2%, 37.3%, 56% and 20.3%, respectively. These values surpass the threshold value of 10% (Falk & Miller, 1992).

The Q² values for all endogenous variables (0.08, 0.29, 0.20, and 0.35 respectively) were above zero that indicated the analytical relevance of the model. We used bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples to evaluate the significance of the parameter estimates (Hair Jr et al., 2017).

4.4. Quantitative Results

The results in Table 5 show that Transformational Leadership has a significantly direct positive effect on Employee Autonomy ($\beta = 0.833$, $p < 0.001$) and on Efficiency ($\beta = 0.271$, $p < 0.05$). These results provide support for H1 and H2, respectively.

Path	Path Coefficient	Standard Errors	t statistics	p values
Transformational Leadership → Employee Autonomy	0,833	0,024	34,746	0
Transformational Leadership → Efficiency	0,271	0,113	2,397	0,017
Employee Autonomy → Efficiency	0,373	0,116	3,2	0,001
Employee Autonomy → Cost Savings	0,257	0,078	3,279	0,001
Employee Autonomy → Unproductive Work Time	-0,11	0,083	1,33	0,184
Efficiency → Cost Savings	0,569	0,067	8,493	0
Efficiency → Unproductive Work Time	-0,387	0,082	4,727	0

Table 5. Structural model assessment.

These results provide support for the Employee Autonomy and the Efficiency being a mediator variable. Both Employee Autonomy and Efficiency, beyond having a significant direct effect with Transformational Leadership, also have significant direct effect on each other ($\beta = 0.373$; $p < 0.01$). Employee Autonomy and Efficiency also have a positive effect on Cost Savings, ($\beta = 0.257$; $p < 0.01$) and ($\beta = 0.569$; $p < 0.01$), respectively.

Indirect Effect	Estimate	Standard Errors	t statistics	p values
Transformational Leadership → Employee Autonomy → Efficiency	0,311	0,100	3,114	0,002
Transformational Leadership → Employee Autonomy → Cost Savings	0,214	0,065	3,292	0,001
Employee Autonomy → Efficiency → Cost Savings	0,212	0,070	3,017	0,003
Transformational Leadership → Employee Autonomy → Efficiency → Cost Savings	0,177	0,060	2,920	0,004
Transformational Leadership → Efficiency → Cost Savings	0,154	0,066	2,344	0,019
Transformational Leadership → Employee Autonomy → Unproductive Work Time	-0,092	0,069	1,333	0,183
Employee Autonomy → Efficiency → Unproductive Work Time	-0,144	0,057	2,512	0,012
Transformational Leadership → Employee Autonomy → Efficiency → Unproductive Work Time	-0,120	0,049	2,440	0,015
Transformational Leadership → Efficiency → Unproductive Work Time	-0,105	0,050	2,098	0,036

Table 6. Bootstrap results for indirect effects.

As we can see Transformational Leadership does not have a direct positive effect on Costs Savings, which means a first negative approach to the H3. To test the mediation on those variables not supported by the Transformational Leadership we followed the recommendations by Hair Jr et al. (2017:232). Therefore, we used a bootstrapping procedure to test the significance of the indirect effects via the mediator (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Table 6 presents the results of the mediation effects.

The indirect effects of Transformational Leadership on Cost Savings are significant via the mediator of Employee Autonomy ($\beta = 0.214$; $p < 0.01$) and via the mediator of Efficiency ($\beta = 0.154$; $p < 0.01$). These results do not provide support for the H3, but for the H4 and H5, first showing the importance of both mediator variables.

Efficiency and employee autonomy also influence as a mediator variable between transformational leadership and the reduction of unproductive work time, ($\beta = -0.105$; $p < 0.05$) and ($\beta = -0.092$; $p < 0.05$) respectively, allowing for them to have an indirect negative impact. This result allows us to not confirm H6 and to confirm H7 and H8.

5. Discussion

According to the theory, Transformational Leadership enables followers to develop their own capabilities in order to have a better performance at work and the premises of the research was to show that the better performance happened with the existence of Employee Autonomy, which meant having proactive and motivated employees that don't need constant controlling and are able to determine their own work processes, having control over agendas and priorities. This first relation was seen in H1 and the results proved that exists a positive and significant relation between the existence of a Transformational Leader and the fact that this Leader creates a work environment where employees are prone to Autonomy, which ultimately are linked with "employee performance, work satisfaction, job involvement, absenteeism, and satisfaction with supervision" (Breugh, 1985:552).

Transformational leaders have high performance expectations, by infusing work with meaning, stimulating followers intellectually, and inspiring them to exceed self-interests, which were confirmed by the first hypothesis, when attesting the connection with the evidence of Employee Autonomy. The results show that leaders with a Transformational approach are more change oriented and proactive themselves, acting as role-models of proactive behavior. Research reveals that transformational leaders enhance positive affect and affective commitment, and both affect and commitment relate positively to proactive behavior (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012).

The transformational leader encourages the adoption of new values, new beliefs and supports the goal for organizational effectiveness (Lebrasseur et al., 2002), which translates in how well a firm maximizes output from the resources it uses. The second hypothesis confirms and relates with positive significance that the input of a Transformational Leader allows the followers to work with Efficiency in mind, managing human resources, material resources and money resources in a sensible way. Core employees have a positive effect in organizational efficiency, by developing their competences and improving the internal processes, whether administrative or technical. Reliable, immediate and adequate records for efficiency are implemented and is measured over time, determining if efficiency has been achieved. The results also prove the theory regarding standardized operations following scientific principles, particularly in terms of planning and work method, which results in processes being up to date whenever is beneficial for performance.

A new contribute to the theory is the direct effect that Employee Autonomy has on Efficiency, which complements what was known about each variable on their own. The presence of autonomy in a worker will mean a great possibility of doing tasks with efficiency in mind, and the other way around, because Efficiency also have a direct impact in Employee Autonomy. These two variables proved to be mediators, both having a direct impact in Cost Savings, which makes possible to prove the fourth hypothesis by an indirect effect of Transformational Leadership.

Extraordinary performance enables a company to achieve cost savings and can be accomplished by identifying the measures of performance indicators and comparing them to internal processes. The input of an employee regarding cost savings alternatives to procedures are important and the results show that leaders are paying attention and implementing them. Theory show that waste analysis is important to identify cost savings opportunities, by eliminating processes that does not add direct value to the product. Also eliminating overproduction, which requires more use of materials, resources and storage. The results showed us that most of the companies, represented by the respondents, are still wasting a lot of time with processes that are seen as a waste of time or simple processes that need superior approvals.

Regarding the last hypothesis, we found theory supporting transformational leadership as a consolidator of teams, by gathering them around an unique goal which reduces not productive results (Kunze & Bruch, 2010), and the results confirm it. We found negative relations between the Unproductive Work Time and Employee Autonomy and Efficiency, in both direct and indirect effects, which means a reduction of unproductive work time every time the evidence shows the signs of workers showing autonomy and efficiency.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Theoretical contributions

Our research objective was to understand if Transformational Leadership as a direct impact in the four dependent variables, more specifically, if increases the autonomy of employees in the work place; if increases organizational efficiency; if increases the awareness and actual cost savings; and if decreases the amount of unproductive work time present in every company. That is accomplished through formulation and testing of four research hypotheses. For that purpose, we applied a questionnaire, preceded by a pre-test procedure, to a sample composed by employees or former employees of companies on various sectors, receiving a total of 174 valid answers.

Leaders who adopt a Transformational approach allow workers to be more autonomous in their work, the autonomy leverage the existence of efficiency in tasks and processes. Efficiency is also transmitted by cost savings, which translates into a reduction of unproductive work time. Also, the mediator effect of Efficiency and Employee Autonomy on the relation between transformational leadership and cost savings and between transformational leadership and unproductive work time, adds notoriety to Efficiency and Employee Autonomy itself, since it allows the increasing importance of both variables to achieve higher results. This finding is a new contribute to the literature because it shows indirect impacts that was not find in the literature during the review.

The dissertation was able to confirm that the managers leadership facilitates motivation and supports autonomous performance which is in line with substantial empirical studies that has been validating the beneficial effects of autonomy-supportive management style and the employee's motivation regarding their job and work performance (Hardré & Reeve, 2009). Validating that autonomy stimulates self-determination in employees, as they can choose alternative ways to approach tasks, experience more ownership, and have a more direct influence on results. This increases their willingness to take responsibility and to persist despite obstacles (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012).

Also, was confirmed that the transformational leader encourages the adoption of new values, new beliefs and supports the goal for organizational effectiveness through effective communication, persuasion and confidence building (Lebrasseur et al., 2002), having a positive effect in organizational efficiency by developing their capabilities and improving the internal processes, making them rare and inimitable. Which transforms into an advantage for the

company since personal skills and personal capabilities are difficult to duplicate, meaning a competitive advantage over others (Lopez-Cabrales et al., 2006).

The results also validate that employees under transformational leadership develop a collective mindset to match the assumptions, values and beliefs about the organization, its goals and methods of operating. There is the adherence to the goal of quality and the goal of cost savings by the members of the team (Lebrasseur et al., 2002).

The results indicate the existence of a relation between transformational leadership and team cohesiveness through collective identification, which is align with a decrease intergroup conflict that is supported by the assignment of a subordinated goal, that allows an increase in productivity and performance, beyond expectations for individuals and for teams (Kunze & Bruch, 2010).

6.2. Managerial Implications

The findings are most interesting in contribution to management because it showed that a transformational approach, which means, empowering the followers, leading based on a strong value system, sacrificing for the benefit of the group, setting an example, inspiring followers to foster innovation, supporting the individual needs of followers, by encouragement and coaching focusing more on their development, can increase productivity, efficiency, cost savings and can reduce unproductive work time.

By giving the opportunity to think and act autonomously, leaders give the employees a sense of responsibility that translates in positive results to the company. As long as leaders reinforce the importance of both positive and negative feedback, giving new visions to old problems, help employees develop themselves, giving opportunity to think autonomously, they will start to raise employees that care about the companies problems and that make the company goals, their goals. It is important that leaders begin to value the needs of employees and to ensure that they have all the conditions to do their job efficiently, and not having to rely on their superiors every step of their responsibilities.

This approach to leadership will decrease a major cause for lack of efficiency in the workplace, the unproductive work time. This last variable aggregates all the pauses and all the daily situations that allows employees to stop and to interrupt a task. It is important to meet employees needs also to prevent it to be a topic, to prevent absence and medical leaves due to stress and not being able to manage daily interactions. A leader is the center of a team and has

to be a solid and focus center, to be able to address all problems, all solutions and all variables that impact that influence on team members.

6.3. Research limitations and future research

Considering the present study, along with the subject under investigation, it is important to consider the following limitations. The sample size was a limitation, considering the universe of companies in Portugal, for a future research we recommend a wider distribution and advertising of the research questionnaire, in order to have a more complete and precise outcome. Regarding an international sample, would be very interesting to collect answers from other countries in order to make a comparison between countries. Regarding the questionnaire, could be seen as a limitation if we consider a more qualitative and descriptive approach to the situation, in which can be suggested to a future research a more in depth interview to really understand how leaders impact in the employees work. The lack of previous research studies on the topic was a limitation because the research should be based on a complete and well-founded literature review, and in line with this limitation we recommend future studies to tackle a systematic review of some important concepts for the research in leadership and management.

For future research we recommend an approach that fits in the pandemic situation that we are still going through, in order to understand the inputs that it generated in the leaders' approach and how it changed the impact on autonomy, efficiency, cost savings and unproductive work time, since the implementation of home office was transversal to most companies.

References

- Ajelabi, I., & Tang, Y. (2010). The Adoption of Benchmarking Principles for Project Management Performance Improvement. *International Journal of Managing Public Sector Information and Communication Technologies (IJMPICT)*, 1(2), 1.
- Anand, G., & Kodali, R. (2008). Benchmarking the benchmarking models. *Benchmarking*, 15(3), 257–291.
- Bagozzi, R., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), 74–94.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1990). Developing Trans-formational Leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14, 21–27.
- Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational Leadership and the Falling Dominoes Effect. *Group & Organization Management*, 12(1), 73–87.
- Bragg, S. (2010). *Cost Reduction Analysis: Tools and Strategies*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Breaugh, J. A. (1985). The Measurement of Work Autonomy. *Human Relations*, 38(6), 551–570.
- Campbell, D. J. (2000). The proactive employee: Managing workplace initiative. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(3), 52–65.
- Colman, A., Norris, C., & Preston, C. (1997). Comparing rating scales of different lengths: Equivalence of scores from 5-point and 7-point scales. *Psychological Reports*, 80(2), 355–362.
- Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. (2013). Business Research Methods. *Business Research Methods*.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance

employee proactive behavior? The role of autonomy and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 194–202.

Falk, R., & Miller, N. (1992). *A Premier for Soft Modelling*.

Fliaster, A., & Schloderer, F. (2010). Dyadic ties among employees: Empirical analysis of creative performance and efficiency. *Human Relations*, 63(10), 1513–1540.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159–170.

Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). *Sage Publications*.

Hardré, P. L., & Reeve, J. (2009). Training corporate managers to adopt a more autonomy-supportive motivating style toward employees: An intervention study. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 13(3), 165–184.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. h

Ho, G. W. K. (2017). Examining Perceptions and Attitudes: A Review of Likert-Type Scales Versus Q-Methodology. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 39(5), 674–689.

Jaca, C., Viles, E., Paipa-Galeano, L., Santos, J., & Mateo, R. (2014). Learning 5S principles from Japanese best practitioners: Case studies of five manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Production Research*, 52(15), 4574–4586.

Jagannathan, A. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3),

308–323.

- Jaskyte, K. (2004). Transformational leadership, organizational culture, and innovativeness in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 15*(2), 153–168.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 751–765.
- Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 246–255.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive/Developmental Analysis. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(4), 648–657.
- Kunze, F., & Bruch, H. (2010). Age-Based Faultlines and Perceived Productive Energy: The Moderation of Transformational Leadership. *Small Group Research, 41*(5), 593–620.
- Lebrasseur, R., Whissell, R., & Ojha, A. (2002). Organisational Learning, Transformational Leadership and Implementation of Continuous Quality Improvement in Canadian Hospitals. *Australian Journal of Management, 27*(2), 141–162.
- Lopez-Cabrales, A., Valle, R., & Herrero, I. (2006). The contribution of core employees to organizational capabilities and efficiency. *Human Resource Management, 45*(1), 81–109.
- Nichols, E., & Hunter Childs, J. (2009). Respondent debriefings conducted by experts: A technique for questionnaire evaluation. *Field Methods, 21*(2), 115–132.
- Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal OF Applied Psychology, 963–974*.
- Preacher, K., & Hayes, A. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*(3), 879–891.

- R. Langabeer II, J., & Helton, J. (2016). *Health Care Operations Management: A Systems Perspective*. Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Will, A. (2015). *SmartPLS3.0*. www.smartpls.de
- Som, A. (2008). Innovative human resource management and corporate performance in the context of economic liberalization in India. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(7), 1278–1297.
- W. Kuhnert, K., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and Transformational Leadership : A Constructive / Developmental Analysis. *Academy Of Management Review*, 12(4), 648–657.
- Waxman, K. (2013). *Financial and Business Management for the Doctor of Nursing Practice*. Springer Publishing Company.
- Wilkinson, D., & Birmingham, P. (2003). *Using research instruments A Guide for Researchers (1st ed)*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- William, F., & Fazleena, B. (2014). Sustainable Value Stream Mapping (Sus-VSM): methodology to visualize and assess manufacturing sustainability performance. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 1(11), 8–18.
- Witzel, M. (2002). A short history of efficiency. *Business Strategy Review*, 13(4), 38–47.

Appendix

Appendix 1 – Questionnaire in Portuguese

A Liderança Transformacional e o Impacto nas Empresas

O presente questionário foi desenvolvido no âmbito da Tese de Mestrado em Gestão de Empresas, tendo como objetivo o estudo do efeito da liderança transformacional nas empresas. Se neste momento estiver desempregado, por favor responda às questões tendo por base o último emprego que teve. A resposta deve ser sempre referente a um emprego em território português.

Grupo 1 - Dados Sociodemográficos

Sexo

Feminino

Masculino

Idade

<20

20-29

30-39

40-49

50-59

>60

Habilitações Literárias

Escola Primária

Escola Secundária

Escola Técnico-Profissional

Licenciatura

Mestrado

Doutoramento

Sector Profissional

Agricultura, produção animal, caça, silvicultura e pesca

Indústrias extractivas

Indústrias transformadoras

Electricidade, gás e águas

Construção

Comércio por grosso e a retalho

Transporte e armazenagem

Alojamento, restauração e similares

Actividades financeiras e de seguros

Actividades imobiliárias

Educação

Actividades de saúde humana e apoio social

Tecnologias de informação

Recursos Humanos

Comunicação e Marketing

Função Pública

Forças Armadas

Direito

Função

Técnico

Administrativo

Comercial

Gestor

Director

Antiguidade (na atual empresa ou na última empresa onde esteve)

< 6 meses

6 meses - 2 anos

2 anos - 5 anos

> 5 anos

Grupo 2 – Liderança Transformacional

Numa escala em que 1 corresponde a "Discordo Totalmente" e 5 corresponde a "Concordo Totalmente", avalie o grau de concordância com as seguintes afirmações:

O meu Chefe/Líder faz com que os colaboradores se sintam bem à sua volta

O meu Chefe/Líder faz com que os colaboradores tenham confiança nele

O meu Chefe/Líder faz com que os colaboradores tenham orgulho de fazer parte da equipa dele

O meu Chefe/Líder incentiva os colaboradores a pensar em soluções inovadoras para problemas do dia-a-dia

O meu Chefe/Líder dá novas visões para cenários aparentemente sem solução

O meu Chefe/Líder ajuda os colaboradores a desenvolverem-se

O meu Chefe/Líder dá feedback positivo aos colaboradores

O meu Chefe/Líder dá feedback negativo aos colaboradores

O meu Chefe/Líder dá especial atenção a quem se sente à parte

Grupo 3 – Autonomia

Numa escala em que 1 corresponde a "Discordo Totalmente" e 5 corresponde a "Concordo Totalmente", avalie o grau de concordância com as seguintes afirmações:

O meu Chefe/Líder dá oportunidade aos colaboradores para pensarem e agirem de forma independente

O meu Chefe/Líder dá oportunidade aos colaboradores para fazerem formações e aprenderem mais

O meu Chefe/Líder dá oportunidade aos colaboradores para serem criativos na forma como solucionam os problemas

O meu Chefe/Líder dá oportunidade aos colaboradores para se desenvolverem e crescerem profissionalmente

O meu Chefe/Líder passa aos colaboradores, quando oportuno, a mensagem de que o trabalho deles é valorizado

O meu Chefe/Líder dá oportunidade aos colaboradores para decidirem os métodos com que fazem o seu trabalho

O meu Chefe/Líder dá oportunidade aos colaboradores para gerirem o seu dia de trabalho

O meu Chefe/Líder dá oportunidade aos colaboradores para concluírem as suas tarefas no período que lhes seja mais conveniente

O meu Chefe/Líder dá oportunidade aos colaboradores para alterarem os seus objectivos profissionais

Grupo 4 – Eficiência

Numa escala em que 1 corresponde a "Discordo Totalmente" e 5 corresponde a "Concordo Totalmente", avalie o grau de concordância com as seguintes afirmações:

Na empresa onde trabalho a gestão dos recursos humanos é feita de forma sensata

Na empresa onde trabalho a gestão dos recursos materiais é feita de forma sensata

Na empresa onde trabalho a gestão dos recursos monetários é feita de forma sensata

Na empresa onde trabalho os colaboradores têm a oportunidade de criar soluções administrativas e/ou técnicas que aumentem a eficiência dos processos

Na empresa onde trabalho é registada e acompanhada a eficiência dos departamentos/áreas/equipas

Na empresa onde trabalho os processos estão bem articulados entre si

Na empresa onde trabalho os processos estão padronizados e são atualizados sempre que é benéfico para o desempenho

Na empresa onde trabalho os colaboradores que atingem os seus objectivos são recompensados através de um prémio monetário ou equivalente

Grupo 5 – Redução de custos

Numa escala em que 1 corresponde a "Discordo Totalmente" e 5 corresponde a "Concordo Totalmente", avalie o grau de concordância com as seguintes afirmações:

Na empresa onde trabalho avaliam os processos que podem ser otimizados com o intuito de reduzir custos

Na empresa onde trabalho valorizam as ideias dos colaboradores quando implicam redução de custos

Na empresa onde trabalho monitorizam os erros cometidos para solucionar e gradualmente deixarem de acontecer

Na empresa onde trabalho existem processos que são considerados perda de tempo

Na empresa onde trabalho perdemos muito tempo com processos simples (devido a aprovações superiores ou equivalente)

Grupo 6 – Tempos de trabalho improdutivos

Numa escala em que 1 corresponde a "Discordo Totalmente" e 5 corresponde a "Concordo Totalmente", avalie o grau de concordância com as seguintes afirmações:

Na empresa onde trabalho perdemos muito tempo à procura de material para trabalhar

Na empresa onde trabalho há falta de comunicação entre departamentos/áreas/equipas

Na empresa onde trabalho há muitos colaboradores a usufruir de baixa médica

Na empresa onde trabalho há muitos colaboradores a demorar mais que o tempo aceitável nas pausas delineadas pela empresa

Na empresa onde trabalho há muitos colaboradores que faltam ao trabalho

Na empresa onde trabalho há recursos humanos insuficientes

Na empresa onde trabalho consigo identificar vários processos simples que passam por mais de uma pessoa para aprovação