FMDB *Transactions on Sustainable Management Letters*

Transformational Leadership and Organizational Performance in Indian Organizations: A Cross-Sector Quantitative Analysis

Kirthi F. Chapparamani[1,*], Asila Abdullah Saif Al Hinai[2], K. Latha[3], Nasima Khaleel Ahamed[4]

[1]Department of Sociology, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India.
[2]College of Economics and Business Administration, University of Technology and Applied Sciences (UTAS), Nizwa, Ad Dakhiliyah, Sultanate of Oman.
[3]Department of Commerce, SCMS School of Technology and Management (SSTM), Cochin, Kerala, India.
[4]Department of Agribusiness and Commerce, Lincoln University, Lincoln, Canterbury, New Zealand.
chapparamanikirti@gmail.com[1], asila.alhinai@utas.edu.om[2], latha4sathi@gmail.com[3], nasima.khaleelahamed@lincoln.ac.nz[4]

Abstract: Motivating employees, aligning strategy to direction, and culture change are all critical parts of leadership that impact organisational results. The present study was conducted across Indian organisations and examined the association between leadership styles and organisational outcomes. It used a quantitative cross-sectional design and administered the survey to 350 employees from the IT, manufacturing, healthcare, and financial services sectors in Delhi NCR, Mumbai, Bengaluru, and Pune. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Organizational Performance Scale were used to collect data. Researchers tested the hypothesis that transformational leadership would have a statistically significant positive effect on organisational performance compared with transactional and laissez-faire leadership. Researchers found that transformational leadership was used in 48% of organizations; these organizations had average performance scores of 4.32 (on a 5-point scale), compared with 3.67 and 2.85 for transactional and laissez-faire leadership, respectively. Results provide statistical evidence that transformational leadership explains 39.2% of the variance in organisational performance ($\beta = 0.418$, $p < 0.001$). Transformational leadership thus facilitated a 58% improvement in employee engagement and a 77% improvement in innovation capacity compared to their laissez-faire counterparts. According to the study, transformational leadership is the most effective approach for modern Indian firms. To benefit from transformational leadership, many organisations must systematically develop leadership. Transformational capabilities help companies outperform competitors financially, innovate more, and retain personnel.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership; Organisational Performance; Employee Engagement; Leadership Effectiveness; Organisational Culture; Financial Services; Transformational Capabilities.

Received on: 07/01/2025, **Revised on:** 30/03/2025, **Accepted on:** 13/07/2025, **Published on:** 09/05/2026

Journal Homepage: https://www.fmdbpub.com/user/journals/details/FTSML

DOI: https://doi.org/10.69888/FTSML.2026.000650

Cite as: K. F. Chapparamani, A. A. S. Al Hinai, K. Latha, and N. K. Ahamed, "Transformational Leadership and Organizational Performance in Indian Organisations: A Cross-Sector Quantitative Analysis," *FMDB Transactions on Sustainable Management Letters*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 48–55, 2026.

1. Introduction

Leadership has become the single greatest predictor of success in the modern business environment, with meta-analytic data indicating that 39% of performance variance is attributable to leadership [1]. The increasing complexity of global markets,

*Corresponding author.

rapid digital transformation, and the emergence of younger generations in the workforce demand new leadership approaches that go beyond traditional management perspectives. With the Indian economy predicted to be the third-largest in the world by 2027, leadership quality has been shown to drive competitiveness across industry sectors. Statistics show that only 27% of employees perceive their managers as highly effective, with 77% of organizations reporting leadership shortfalls and 83% affirming that leadership development is important [4]; [19]. Indian organisations, like their counterparts elsewhere, face unique challenges, including a multigenerational workforce, a cultural shift from hierarchical to participative leadership, and competition in knowledge-intensive global markets.

According to research by Companies with Strong Leadership Make More Money (a Wall Street Journal report), companies with solid leadership report financial performance 2.3 times that of competitors and overall performance metrics 20% higher. But 58 percent of Indian managers do not receive any formal leadership training, creating what Nayak and Mishra [11] call a "critical capability gap". Challenges in this business environment have only become more complex in the post-pandemic context, where 72% of leaders have reported symptoms of burnout and only 28% of employees strongly agreed that leadership actually cares about their wellbeing [14]; [6]. Hence, this research addresses these burning issues by exploring the effects of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles on organisational performance across financial, innovation, operational, customer, and employee performance dimensions. In the context of India, this research specifically examines 350 employees in major metropolitan cities across the IT, manufacturing, healthcare, and financial services sectors. It provides unique empirical evidence to substantiate the role of leadership in developing organisational excellence [7]; [16].

2. Literature Review

Transformational leadership, along with idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration, leads to greater follower motivation than does transactional leadership [3]; [4]. Wang et al. [23], in a meta-analytic review, confirmed the importance of this leadership style and reported that transformational leadership is one of the primary behavioral antecedents of performance at different organizational levels (individual, group or team, and organizational), accounting for between 30% and 40% of performance variance. Using new evidence from his longitudinal panel study based on the 2004 and 2011 Workplace Employment Relations Survey, it was found that a change of one standard deviation of leadership quality results in a 0.27 standard deviation increase of organisational performance, a 0.73 standard deviation increase in job satisfaction, and a 0.73 standard deviation decrease of job anxiety [8]. These results would confirm that leadership has a dual impact on both organisational performance and employee well-being. Rodriguez et al. [20] demonstrated that transformational leadership improves organisational performance through the mediation of knowledge management, where knowledge creation processes act as important transmission mechanisms [21]; [9].

In the context of cross–cultural research, Sertel et al. [15] conducted a meta-analysis across 15 nations. They revealed that leadership effects on performance differ across cultural dimensions, with groups from collectivist societies responding more strongly to a transformational leadership style. Dhingra et al. [6] highlight that, especially in Indian contexts, Transformational and Laissez-Faire tendencies are affected by hierarchical norms, and the collective cultural norms of Indian leaders lead them to score high on openness, trust, and collaboration. A study by Nayak and Mishra [11] on leadership styles and organizational effectiveness was one of the empirical studies to find significant relationships between leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in Indian public sector organizations. Recent research by Lai et al. [10] showed that work engagement serves as a mediator between transformational leadership and job performance, in which transformational behaviours sparked follower absorption, which in turn led to higher-quality task performance and quality helping behaviours. And Walumbwa and Hartnell [22] found that transformational leadership is rooted in relational identification and self-efficacy, which are deemed the fundamental mechanisms linking transformational leadership to employee performance. These mediated paths tell the story of how leadership affects organisational outcomes by driving psychological and behavioural change among employees [24]; [13].

In his recent work on strategies for conflict resolution, Singh [18] found that leadership capability in interpersonal management drives team performance and that resolving conflict improves cohesion by 34% and productivity by 28%. Additionally, Singh [17] demonstrated, through an analytical investigation of quantitative approaches in strategic decision-making, that leadership behaviours informed by data significantly improve decision quality by 42% and the effectiveness of strategic implementation by 37%. Bass et al. [5] conducted a longitudinal study and confirmed that transformational and transactional leadership predicted unit performance, with superior predictive validity for transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.05$) and transactional leadership ($\beta = 0.19$, $p < 0.05$). It speaks of leadership equity as a near-calibre, and provides data that supports collective conclusions across the literature that transformational leadership is generally the most beneficial counter style; theme mediators within employee experience, including engagement, organisational culture, and knowledge processes; the culture-context proposition that leadership effectiveness is a function of cultural context; and systematic leadership development has predictable performance returns [2]; [12]. This provides a useful context for the current study's hypotheses and methods.

2.1. Objectives

- To examine the relationship between different leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) and organisational performance across five key dimensions in Indian organisations.
- To identify the specific leadership behaviours and characteristics that contribute most significantly to enhanced organisational outcomes through correlation analysis.
- To analyse the mediating factors through which leadership influences organisational performance, including employee engagement, innovation culture, and training investment.

3. Methodology

This research used an explanatory cross-sectional survey design to investigate the association between leadership styles and organisational performance across diverse organisational contexts in India. Employees from sectors such as information technology, manufacturing, healthcare, and financial services from major metropolitan cities, including Delhi NCR, Mumbai, Bengaluru, and Pune, formed the target population. Researchers used a stratified random sampling method to ensure representation across levels, sectors, and demographics. The sample (IT=98, Manufacturing=87, Financial Services=76, Healthcare=54, Retail=35) and organizational level (supervisory=120, middle management=150, senior executives=80) were detailed. In the end, the final sample also included 350 respondents from working organizational contexts. The second and third thirds of the standardised instruments were used for data collection. Method: The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-Form 5X) was used to evaluate leadership styles across the predominant dimensions of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration), transactional leadership (contingent reward, management-by-exception), and laissez-faire leadership.

The dependent variable, organisational performance, was defined by an Organisational Performance Scale that comprised five dimensions: Financial performance (profitability, revenue growth), operational efficiency (process optimisation, resource utilisation), innovation capacity (new product development, creative solutions), customer satisfaction (service quality, loyalty metrics), and employee productivity (output per employee, efficiency ratios). Other validated scales were used to measure employee engagement (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and work engagement), innovation culture, and training investment. In all cases, Researchers used 5-point Likert scales (1=Strongly Disagree to Agree 5=Strongly) to ensure consistent measurement. The survey was an electronic cross-sectional study conducted from January to March 2024 via an anonymous online platform. Targeted invitations with unique codes to prevent multiple responses. A total of 350 completed questionnaires were analysed from 400 distributed, yielding a response rate of 87.5% and exceeding the minimum required for statistical power analysis. Researchers assessed non-response bias by comparing early and late respondents on important demographic measures and found no differences (p>05). Comprehensive data analysis was performed using SPSS version 26.0 and included all data-analytic steps. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies), reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha), and appropriate assumption-testing procedures for parametric statistics were included in the preliminary analyses.

Reliability analysis showed that the three scales of transformational leadership, organisational performance, and employee engagement had Cronbach's alphas greater than 0.90 (0.92, 0.89, and 0.87, respectively). Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests and visual inspection of Q-Q plots were used to assess the normality of the data. All variance inflation factors for the covariates (>3.0; Declaration of Helsinki) confirmed the absence of problematic multicollinearity. Homoscedasticity was checked using Levene's test for Homogeneity of Variances and a residual plot. The primary methodological approach was a one-way ANOVA comparing organisational performance outcomes across leadership style groups, with post hoc Tukey HSD tests for pairwise comparisons. Pearson's correlation analysis was used to examine bivariate relationships between individual leadership behaviours and each performance outcome. To evaluate the relative predictive contributions of transformational leadership, employee engagement, innovation culture, and training investment to organisational performance, a multiple regression analysis was conducted, with standardised beta coefficients reflecting the unique contributions of each independent variable while controlling for the others. All analyses were performed at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level to assess statistical significance.

4. Results

Results of quantitative analysis (for example, correlational analysis) identified a significant link between leadership styles and organisational performance across both qualitative and quantitative dimensions. The subsequent Tables present the findings and interpret the statistics for each research objective.

Table 1: Leadership style distribution across organisations (N=350)

Leadership Style	Frequency	Percentage	Mean Performance Score	Standard Deviation
Transformational	168	48.0%	4.32	0.54
Transactional	126	36.0%	3.67	0.62
Laissez-faire	35	10.0%	2.85	0.71

Mixed/Hybrid	21	6.0%	3.91	0.58

Objective 1 is addressed by presenting the distribution of leadership styles among 350 surveyed employees from Indian organizations in Table 1. There is a predominance of transformational leadership, which achieved the highest mean performance score (High-Performance: 4.32 points on a 5-point scale) and was superior to laissez-faire leadership by 51%, with a performance score of only 2.85. Transactional leadership is common in 36% of organisations, achieving a moderate performance score of 3.67. Although laissez-faire leadership correlates with the poorest organisational outcomes (prevalence of only 10 percent), classifiers using a hybrid of transformational and transactional approaches achieve a performance score of 3.91. These distributions demonstrate unambiguous links between leadership styles and performance outcomes, and the advantages of transformational approaches are statistically and practically significant. The standard deviation (SD) values suggest that, at least across categories, performance is relatively consistent, with the greatest variation adjacent to laissez-faire (SD = 0.71).

Table 2: Leadership impact on employee engagement metrics (N=350)

Engagement Dimension	Transformational (Mean)	Transactional (Mean)	Laissez-faire (Mean)	F-value	p-value	Effect Size (η^2)
Job Satisfaction	4.21	3.54	2.67	87.32	<0.001	0.335
Organizational Commitment	4.18	3.48	2.71	82.15	<0.001	0.322
Work Engagement	4.29	3.61	2.79	91.47	<0.001	0.346
Turnover Intention (Reverse)	2.13	3.26	4.18	76.89	<0.001	0.308

Table 2 shows mean differences in employee engagement metrics by leadership style, which relate to Objective 1 and, through mediating effects, to Objective 3. Job satisfaction scores with transformational leadership are 4.21, 19% higher than with transactional leadership (3.54) and 58% higher than with laissez-faire leadership (2.67). All F-values > 76.89 and $p < 0.001$ indicate statistically significant results with a high degree of confidence. Corresponding to Yukl [25] effect sizes (η^2) from 0.308 to 0.346 represent large practical significance [23]. Compared with other variables, this demonstrated the largest differential, with $F = 91.47$ and $\eta^2 = 0.346$, indicating that transformational leadership has a wide-reaching effect on employee immersion (work engagement). Further, turnover intention is 49% lower under transformational leadership (2.13) than under laissez-faire leadership (4.18), providing critically important empirical substantiation for the retention benefits, worth millions of dollars annually to large organizations. The present findings corroborate the centrality of employee engagement as a core mediating mechanism linking leadership to organisational performance (Table 3).

Table 3: Organisational performance indicators by leadership style (N=350)

Performance Indicator	Transformational	Transactional	Laissez-faire	F-value	p-value
Financial Performance	4.15	3.42	2.58	94.28	<0.001
Innovation Capacity	4.27	3.29	2.41	102.56	<0.001
Operational Efficiency	4.08	3.56	2.73	78.43	<0.001
Customer Satisfaction	4.19	3.51	2.69	86.71	<0.001
Employee Productivity	4.24	3.47	2.62	89.95	<0.001

Objective 1 is examined in detail through five key organisational performance indicators vis-à-vis leadership styles. The differential is greatest for innovation capacity, 4.27 for transformational vs 2.41 for laissez-faire, a performance gap of 77%, with an F-value of 102.56, the highest of the analyses. Transformational leadership (4.15) outpaces transactional leadership by 21 percent and laissez-faire by 61 percent in financial performance, resulting in significant revenue and profits and exceeding the mean score. Employee productivity patterns align with the trends outlined above: Transformational comes in at 4.24, which is 22% higher than transactional and 62% higher than laissez-faire. Statistical significance ($p<0.001$ for all performance differences) provides robust empirical evidence. The informative parallel with other metrics of organizational excellence suggests systemic, rather than piecemeal, benefits that would directly validate the study's central proposition: that transformational leadership contributes significantly to improvements in organizational performance. Table 4 lists specific leadership behaviours associated with organisational outcomes. The correlation with innovation is very strong for intellectual stimulation ($r=0.789$, $p<0.01$), indicating that pushing people well outside their comfort zone and away from routinely accepted assumptions directly and positively drives innovation. This correlation implies that intellectual stimulation behaviors account for 62% of the variance in innovation. Regardless of the performance measurement, inspirational motivation shows the strongest correlation with total organisational performance ($r=0.742$, $p<0.01$) and explains 55% of the variance in performance, cementing vision articulation as a foundational element of the pathway to excellence.

Table 4: Correlation analysis between leadership behaviours and performance (N=350)

Leadership Behavior	Organizational Performance	Employee Engagement	Innovation	Customer Satisfaction	Pearson r Range
Inspirational Motivation	0.742**	0.698**	0.721**	0.709**	0.698-0.742
Intellectual Stimulation	0.716**	0.654**	0.789**	0.687**	0.654-0.789
Individualized Consideration	0.687**	0.732**	0.643**	0.701**	0.643-0.732
Idealized Influence	0.729**	0.709**	0.698**	0.715**	0.698-0.729

Note: *** Correlation significant at p<0.01 level (2-tailed)*

The highest correlation with engagement (r=0.732, p<0.01) was observed for Individualised consideration, indicating a commitment to personal attention and accounting for 54% of the engagement variance. The model of role model influences shows strong correlations for all outcomes (r = 0.698-0.729), but idealised influence shows very strong correlations across all outcomes (r = 0.698-0.729). Thus, these four transformational behaviours seem to explain 41-62% of the variance in key outcomes, and all correlations exceed r = 0.64, indicating actionable development priorities for leadership training programs.

Table 5: Sector-wise leadership effectiveness analysis (N=350)

Sector	Sample Size	Transformational %	Mean Performance	Leadership Training Hours	Performance Rank
IT & Technology	98	62%	4.41	48	1
Financial Services	76	53%	4.18	42	2
Manufacturing	87	41%	3.89	32	3
Healthcare	54	38%	3.74	28	4
Retail & Services	35	34%	3.62	24	5

Sector-specific analysis of contextual differences in leadership performance for Objective 1 and Objective 3 is provided in Table 5. Notably, the IT sector shows the highest prevalence of transformational leadership (62%), the highest performance (4.41), and the highest number of training hours per year. This is 22% more performance than the sector average (3.62) and 100% more investment in training (48 vs 24 hours). Second is Financial services (53% transformation prevalence, 4.18 performance, and 42 hours of training), showing that knowledge-intensive sectors acknowledge that leadership counts as a strategic capability. Manufacturing and healthcare have very moderate adoption (41%, 38%) and moderate performance outcomes (3.89, 3.74) within their respective sectors. Algebraically simple relationships manifest between the investment in workforce leadership training and transformational adoption (r=0.94) and performance outcomes (r=0.96). The lowest transformational prevalence (34%), training (24 hours), performance (3.62), and practice sectors include retail. Findings that are definitely a strategic imperative for leadership development investments. These sector distinctions imply that competitive pressure and talent needs underlie the prioritisation of leadership development.

Table 6: Regression analysis - leadership predictors of organisational performance (N=350)

Predictor Variable	Beta Coefficient (β)	Standard Error	t-value	p-value	Variance Explained (R^2)	95% CI
Transformational Leadership	0.418	0.052	8.04	<0.001	39.2%	[0.316, 0.520]
Employee Engagement	0.267	0.048	5.56	<0.001	16.8%	[0.173, 0.361]
Innovation Culture	0.189	0.054	3.50	<0.001	9.7%	[0.083, 0.295]
Training Investment	0.143	0.061	2.34	0.020	5.3%	[0.023, 0.263]

Model Statistics: *R^2=0.71, Adjusted R^2=0.695, F(4,345)=94.32, p<0.001*

For each of Objectives 1, 2, and 3, Researchers summarised the regression analyses directly related to each Objective in Table 6, demonstrating leaders' ability to predict organisational performance. The strongest predictor, with confirmed rank as the most important factor for organisational success, is transformational leadership modelling (β=0.418, p<0.001), which accounts for 39.2% of the variance in performance. Researchers have this relationship well when they find it falls within a 95% confidence interval [0.316, 0.520]. As per Objective 3, the validating role of employee engagement as a critical mediating mechanism is further substantiated by an additional 16.8% of variance explained (β = 0.267, p < 0.001). As shown in Table 6, innovation culture contributes 9.7% (β=0.189, p<0.001) to output, while training investment adds 5.3% (β=0.143, p=0.020). The full model explains 71% of the variance in organisational performance (model: F=94.32, p<0.001, adjusted R^2=0.695). In fact, transformational leadership explains greater variance than all other predictors combined in this model, providing strong

empirical support for emphasising its development. Training investment contributes significantly to other returns across industries, thereby validating the ROI of leadership development programs.

5. Discussion

Results validate all three research objectives; together, the findings furnish powerful empirical support for the centrality of leadership to organizational performance. Confirming the hypothesis of Objective 1, transformational leadership was reported in 48% of the organisations surveyed, with a mean performance score of 4.32. These results (51%) clearly indicate that effective leadership performance is the determining factor in organizational destinies, rather than a marginal improvement over laissez-faire approaches (4.32 vs 2.85). The average effect size is consistent with Haile's [8] research, which found that improvements in leadership qualities increase organisational performance by 0.27 standard deviations. To address Objective 2, the correlation analysis in Table 4 shows the most impactful leadership behaviours in relation to outcomes. The correlation coefficient of r = 0.789 of this would, at the very least, imply that leaders who challenge the assumption that everything has always been done this way, therefore it's correct, and encourage innovative thinking, are having a much larger impact on the innovations needed for a firm to maintain strategic competitiveness and are thus part of the innovation equation. This response aligns with Singh [17] research, which shows that data-driven decision-making approaches improve decision quality by 42%. The foundational role of vision articulation in excellence is evidenced by the r = 0.742 correlation between inspirational motivation and overall performance. At the same time, the contribution of personalized developmental support to engaged and committed workforces is supported by the r=0.732 correlation between individualized consideration and engagement [18].

Tables 2 and 6 provide strong empirical support for the mediating mechanisms identified in Objective 3. The $\beta = 0.267$ coefficient and the 16.8% of variance explained for employee engagement confirm that leadership affects performance through this vital pathway. These scores represent a 58%-unit improvement in job satisfaction (4.21 vs 2.67) between individuals at the transformational versus those at the laissez-faire end of the leadership continuum, as well as a 49% reduction in turnover intentions (2.13 vs 4.18), showing that the people-centric aspect of human capital is not immune to the effects of leadership. Since replacing an employee costs 50-200% of an employee's annual salary, retention benefits can yield millions in cost savings for larger organizations. Additionally, the 9.7% contribution to variance ($\beta = 0.189$) for innovation culture indicates that organisational culture can again be considered a mediating variable, as transformational leadership develops organisational cultures that promote creativity and experimentation. Table 5 provides context that affects leader effectiveness. Knowledge-intensive sectors such as IT, with 62% transformational prevalence, an annual investment of 48 hours, and a performance score of 4.41, reflect the view that leadership binds strategic capability. The 100% differential in time spent training leaders (4.41 hours for IT vs 3.62 hours for retail) perfectly aligns with the 22% performance gap between the two sectors, providing a compelling business case for more systematic leadership development. Consistent with the $\beta = 0.143$ regression coefficient for training investment, top-performing organisations invest nearly twice as much in leadership training as bottom-performing organisations.

These results help explain why, despite empirical research indicating that investment in manager training yields considerable performance payoffs, over half (58%) of managers receive no formal training whatsoever [4]. The research question concerned the role of effortful control in leadership, and a regression analysis ultimately confirmed that transformational leadership explains 39%. % of performance variance (50). This result corroborates meta-analytic evidence that 30%-40% of the variance in organisational performance is attributable to leadership, thereby supporting the reliability of the current study's methods and outcomes [19]. The variance explained by the overall model (71% $F = 94.32$, $p < 0.001$) indicates the extent to which leadership and its mediating mechanisms account for differences in organisational performance. This exceeds what is common for social science models (explaining 40–50% of the variance) and indicates strong predictive validity. The 77% innovation capacity disadvantage of laissez-faire (2.41) versus transformational (4.27) leadership is especially consequential for Indian organizations competing in global innovation-driving markets. When leaders demonstrate intellectual stimulation, they create an environment of psychological safety that encourages employees to challenge assumptions, try new ways of doing things, and learn from mistakes without fear of punishment. It results in sustainable innovation cultures that create competitive advantages that competitors cannot replicate. Seeking to support these findings, Singh [18] conducted research on conflict resolution strategies, further highlighting the importance of leader behaviour in interpersonal dynamics as a determinant of team performance, enhancing team cohesion by 34% and teamwork productivity by 28%.

This research extends that approach and confirms that transformational leadership has an organization-wide effect rather than phenomena at the team level, permeating financial performance, innovation, customer satisfaction, and operational effectiveness. A line of reasoning closely resembling this, Singh [17] then goes on to critically examine quantitative approaches, and his claim about the evidence-based nature of such designs reinforces the statistical approach supporting this research, thereby building confidence in the findings. The Indian milieu brings its own nuances; organisations are already transitioning from traditional hierarchical models to participative styles. This transition seems to yield significant benefits, with transformational leadership effective because of its cultural fit with Indian collectivism (characterized by openness, trust, and

collaboration). But with only a 48% transformational prevalence, this shows there is plenty more progress to be made, especially in the manufacturing (41%), healthcare (38%), and retail (34%) sectors, where adoption is yet to reach and surpass the 50% mark. By increasing the proportion of transformational leadership to levels seen in IT sectors (62 percent) in other sectors, organisations could realise 15–20 percent improvements in performance. The bottom line is clear: Organisations should develop transformational leaders through systematic training, 360-degree feedback, coaching interventions, and succession planning. The $\beta = 0.143$ training investment coefficient, although smaller than that for transformational leadership, indicates a measurable ROI that justifies development expenditures. Since leadership development enhances learning capacity by 25% and performance by 20%, and companies with more talented managers have 147% higher earnings per share, the business case for leadership development is compelling.

6. Conclusion

The current study establishes beyond a doubt that leadership is the backbone of organisational performance and that transformational leadership is the best model for modern Indian organisations. Transformational leadership accounts for 39.2% of the variance in organisational performance ($\beta = 0.418$, $p < 0.001$), making it the single most important variable in explaining organisational performance. The performance score of organizations that practice transformational leadership is 51% higher (4.32 vs. 2.85) ($p < 0.001$; $d = 1.4$) than those practicing the laissez-faire approach; transformational leadership produces significant advantages over laissez-faire in financial results (61% improvement), innovation (77% improvement), operational effectiveness (49% improvement), customer satisfaction (56% improvement), and employee productivity (62% improvement) The results distinctly validate all three research objectives transformational styles are unambiguously related to performance, specific transformational behaviors drive the transformation and the mediating mechanisms of employee engagement, innovation culture and training investment clearly account for the relations. In a time when the business environment is becoming more complex and competitive, creating sustainable competitive advantage as part of organisational purpose, organisations that are serious about reshaping their future know that leadership development is not just an option but a foundation for organisational destiny. The way forward is through disciplined investment in developing transformational skills such as inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, and idealized influence, especially in the manufacturing, health care, and retail industries (where up to 40% of organisations report minimal use of transformational leadership). More longitudinal studies of leadership interventions are needed, along with a broader understanding of generational responsiveness to leadership and of cultural moderators that may be effective across India.

Acknowledgement: N/A

Data Availability Statement: Data supporting this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to ethical and institutional guidelines.

Funding Statement: This research received no external funding or financial support.

Conflicts of Interest Statement: The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this work.

Ethics and Consent Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with established ethical standards. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and all data were anonymised to ensure privacy and confidentiality.

References

1. E. H. Al Khajeh, "Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance," *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, vol. 2018, no. 10, pp. 1–10, 2018.
2. A. Alrowwad, S. H. Abualoush, and R. Masa'deh, "Innovation and intellectual capital as intermediary variables among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and organizational performance," *Journal of Management Development*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 196–222, 2020.
3. B. M. Bass, "Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations," *Free Press*, New York, United States of America, 1985.
4. B. M. Bass and B. J. Avolio, "Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership," *Sage Publications*, Thousand Oaks, California, United States of America, 1994.
5. B. M. Bass, B. J. Avolio, D. I. Jung, and Y. Berson, "Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 88, no. 2, pp. 207–218, 2003.
6. D. Dhingra, S. Srivastava, and N. Srivastava, "The impact of leadership styles, cultural dimensions and values on academic leaders," *International Journal of Experimental Research and Review*, vol. 44, no. 10, pp. 76–90, 2024.

7. V. J. García-Morales, F. J. Lloréns-Montes, and A. J. Verdú-Jover, "The effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance through knowledge and innovation," *British Journal of Management*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 299–319, 2008.
8. G. A. Haile, "Organizational leadership: How much does it matter?" *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 653-673, 2023.
9. M. Kılıç and O. Uludağ, "The effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance: Testing the mediating effects of knowledge management," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 14, p. 7981, 2021.
10. F. Y. Lai, H. C. Tang, S. C. Lu, Y. C. Lee, and C. C. Lin, "Transformational leadership and job performance: The mediating role of work engagement," *SAGE Open*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2020.
11. B. Nayak and B. B. Mishra, "Impact of leadership style on organizational effectiveness," *Management and Labour Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 90-103, 2005.
12. F. A. Naufal, "The impact of transformational leadership on employee performance with learning orientation as mediating role," D3 thesis, *Universitas Andalas*, Padang, Indonesia, 2017. [Accessed by 13/11/2024].
13. J. Nasamu, E. Adejoh, T. P. Tukura, E. S. Yahaya, A. U. Okpanachi, and F. J. Edah, "The impact of transformational leadership on public sector organisations in Nigeria: A review," *International Journal of Global Affairs, Research and Development*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 172–189, 2025.
14. B. Tambaip, Y. Ohoiwutun, A. P. Tjilen, and H. Y. Muslihin, "Transformational leadership in preserving local culture: Strategies for facing the digital era," *AVE Trends in Intelligent Management Letters*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2025.
15. G. Sertel, E. Karadag, and H. Ergin-Kocatürk, "Effects of leadership on performance: A cross-cultural meta-analysis," *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 59–82, 2022.
16. F. Anistya, Z. Assyfa, R. Sinaga, I. Muda, and S. A. Kesuma, "Synergy of decision making theory and organizational performance: A systematic exploration of decision quality," *AVE Trends in Intelligent Social Letters*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 187–196, 2024.
17. U. P. Singh, "An analytical examination of quantitative methods and managerial economics in enhancing strategic decision-making," *Global Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2022.
18. U. P. Singh, "A study on conflict resolution strategies and their effectiveness in team management," *International Journal of Management Research & Review*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1–10, 2023.
19. M. N. A. Anandavalli and S. A. Raj, "Emotional intelligence in financial leadership: Strengthening investor confidence in India's banking sector amidst a VUCA environment," *AVE Trends in Intelligent Management Letters*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 214–223, 2025.
20. M. V. A. Rodriguez, D. S. Tuazon, M. P. C. Espinosa, N. T. Florencondia, and L. E. Pascual, "Steering through crisis: An examination of leadership responses and governance effectiveness in Philippine public administration in the post-pandemic era," *International Journal of Progressive Research in Science and Engineering*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 212–219, 2024.
21. G. Josephine, V. Pradeep, and A. Kamanaluri, "Study of tourism business as a tool for financial development in Rwanda," *AVE Trends in Intelligent Management Letters*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 178–186, 2025.
22. F. O. Walumbwa and C. A. Hartnell, "Understanding transformational leadership–employee performance links: The role of relational identification and self-efficacy," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 153–172, 2011.
23. G. Wang, I. S. Oh, S. H. Courtright, and A. E. Colbert, "Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research," *Group & Organization Management*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 223–270, 2011.
24. N. Geethanjali, K. M. Ashifa, A. Raina, J. Patil, R. Byloppilly, and S. S. Rajest, "Application of strategic human resource management models for organizational performance," in *Advances in Business Information Systems and Analytics, Hershey, Pennsylvania, IGI Global*, United States of America, 2023.
25. G. A. Yukl, "Leadership in Organizations," 8th ed., *Pearson Education*, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America, 2013.