



T.C.

TOKAT GAZİOSMANPAŞA UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE

DEPARTMENT OF BUSSINES ADMINISTRATION

MASTER'S PROGRAM

**THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON PERFORMANCE:
ANALYTICAL STUDY ON BUSINESS COMPANIES EMPLOYERS IN
NORTHERN IRAQ**

MASTER THESIS

Aso Ali MOHAMMED

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Musa Said DÖVEN

TOKAT - 2025

ETHICAL CONTRACT

I hereby declare that the Master's thesis titled "The Effects of Leadership Styles on Performance: Analytical Study on Business Companies Employers in Northern Iraq", which I prepared under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Musa Said DÖVEN, in accordance with the thesis writing guide of Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University Graduate Education Institute, is an original work that complies with scientific ethical values and rules, and that I will accept all legal sanctions if the contrary is detected.

08/08/2025

Aso Ali MOHAMMED

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank God for making it easy for me and giving me the strength and patience to complete this research and continue my blood donation.

I am very grateful to my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Musa Said DÖVEN, who has always given me valuable guidance and has always been with me to keep my research at the highest scientific level reaching this stage.

I thank my parents for their support since childhood, their love and prayers, and their help is the great engine and motivation of my achievements.

I thank my wife for being my supporter, friend and colleague, traveling with me to a second country and away from his family. His love, patience and constant understanding have been an effective motivator for our success.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Tokat Gaziosmanpasa University for providing me with the resources and environment to pursue my research. Your support has been vital to this achievement.

Thank you all.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to:

My parents, whose endless sacrifices, wisdom, and faith in me have inspired me to strive for excellence.

My beloved wife, whose unwavering love, patience, and encouragement have been my greatest source of strength throughout this journey.

My children (Lima and Khuncha) for being a constant reminder of hope and purpose in my life.

My supervisor, for believing in my potential and guiding me with expertise and care.

And finally, to everyone who supported me, believed in me, and shared this journey with me.

ABSTRACT**THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON PERFORMANCE: ANALYTICAL
STUDY ON BUSINESS COMPANIES EMPLOYERS IN NORTHERN IRAQ**

Mohammed Aso Ali

Master Thesis, Department Business Administration

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Musa Said Döven

August 2025 , xii + 97 pages

This study examines how individual performance is affected by leadership styles, particularly toxic and servant leadership, in business organizations located in Sulaimani, Northern Iraq. Examining the relationship between employee outcomes and leadership behaviors while taking age, gender, and work experience into account is the main goal. A structured questionnaire comprising a measurement of individual performance and scales for toxic leadership and servant leadership was used to gather data. 400 participants from a variety of industries made up the sample

Individual performance showed a negative correlation with toxic leadership and a positive correlation with servant leadership, according to descriptive statistics used to analyze the data. Both leadership philosophies significantly predicted individual performance, according to regression analyses, but servant leadership had a stronger beneficial effect. Perceptions of leadership styles and performance levels were not significantly impacted by demographic factors like age or gender, indicating that leadership quality is universally important. These results highlight the value of leadership development and offer organizations in Northern Iraq practical advice on how to improve worker performance through encouraging leadership practices. The findings have contributed wider understanding of leadership dynamics in Middle Eastern business settings.

Keywords: Leadership Styles, Individual Performance, Servant leadership Style, Toxic Leadership Style.

ÖZET

LİDERLİK STİLLERİNİN PERFORMANS ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİLERİ: KUZEY IRAK'TAKİ İŞVERENLER ÜZERİNE ANALİTİK BİR ÇALIŞMA

Mohammed Aso Ali

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İşletme ABD

Doç. Dr. Musa Said Döven

Ağustos 2025, xii + 97 sayfa

Bu çalışma, Kuzey Irak'ın Süleymaniye kentinde bulunan işletmelerde bireysel performansın, özellikle toksik ve hizmetkâr liderlik olmak üzere liderlik tarzlarından nasıl etkilendiğini incelemektedir. Çalışan çıktıları ile liderlik davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi yaş, cinsiyet ve iş deneyimi dikkate alınarak incelemek temel amaçtır. Veri toplamak için bireysel performans ölçümü ve toksik liderlik ile hizmetkâr liderlik ölçeklerinden oluşan yapılandırılmış bir anket kullanılmıştır. Örneklem, çeşitli sektörlerden 400 katılımcıdan oluşmaktadır.

Verileri analiz etmek için kullanılan betimleyici istatistiklere göre, bireysel performans toksik liderlikle negatif, hizmetkâr liderlikle ise pozitif korelasyon göstermiştir. Regresyon analizlerine göre her iki liderlik felsefesi de bireysel performansı anlamlı şekilde öngörmüş, ancak hizmetkâr liderliğin daha güçlü bir faydalı etkisi olmuştur. Liderlik tarzları ve performans düzeylerine ilişkin algılar, yaş veya cinsiyet gibi demografik faktörlerden önemli ölçüde etkilenmemiştir; bu da liderlik kalitesinin evrensel olarak önemli olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu sonuçlar, liderlik gelişiminin değerini vurgulamakta ve Kuzey Irak'taki kuruluşlara, liderlik uygulamalarını teşvik ederek çalışan performansını nasıl iyileştirebilecekleri konusunda pratik tavsiyeler sunmaktadır. Bulgular, Orta Doğu iş dünyasında liderlik dinamiklerinin daha iyi anlaşılmasına katkıda bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Liderlik Stilleri, Bireysel Performans, Hizmetkar Liderlik Stili, Toksik Liderlik Stili.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Ethical Contract.....	I
Acknowledgments	II
Dedication	III
Abstract.....	IV
Özet	V
Table Of Content	VI
List Of Tables.....	IX
List Of Figures	XI

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Questions:	2
1.2 Importance Of The Study.....	3
1.3 Objectives Of The Study.....	3
1.4. Hypotheses Of The Study:	4
1.5. Structure Of The Research.....	4

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW	6
1.1. Leadership.....	6
1.2. Leadership Theories	7
1.2.1 Trait Theory	8
1.2.2 Behavioral Theory	9
1.2.3 Contingency Theory	9
1.2.4 Transactional And Transformational Leadership	10
1.2.5. Modern Theories.....	10
1.2.5.1 Authentic Leadership.....	11
1.2.5.2 Situational Leadership	12
1.2.5.3 Autocratic Leadership Style.....	12
1.2.5.4 Paternalistic Leadership Style.....	13
1.2.5.5 Charismatic Leadership Style	13
1.2.5.6 Bureaucratic Leadership Style	14
1.2.5.7 Laissez-Faire Leadership Style	14
1.2.5.8 Democratic (Or Participative) Leadership Style.....	15
1.3 Servant And Toxic Leadership Styles.....	15
1.3.1 Servant Leadership Style	16
1.3.2 Toxic Leadership Style	18
1.4. Characteristics Of Leaders	20
1.5. Differences Between Leadership And Management	22

1.6. Leadership In Emerging Economies	24
CHAPTER 2: PERFORMANCE	28
2.1. Definition and Evaluation Of Performance	28
2.2. Relevance of Individual Performance	29
2.2.1 Factors Influencing Individual Performance	31
2.2.1.1. Internal And Individual-Level Factors.....	31
2.2.1.2. External And Organizational Factors	32
2.2.2. Improve Individual Performance	33
2.2.2.1 Employee Motivation	34
2.2.2.2 Employee Ability	35
2.2.2.3 Employee Role Clarity.....	36
2.3. Servant Leadership, Toxic Leadership, And Their Impact On Individual Performance	36
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH	42
3.1 Purpose Of The Research.....	42
3.2 The Importance Of Research	42
3.3 The Hypothesis Of Research.....	44
3.4 Questionnaire Design Structure	44
3.5 Research Methodology	45
3.6 Research Population.....	46
3.7 Sample Of The Research.....	46
3.8. Research Procedure.....	48
3.9 Limitation Of The Study	49
3.10 Analysis And Findings.....	50
3.10.1 Cronbach`S Alpha Based On Reliability Statistics	50
3.10.2. Cronbach`S Alpha Based On Scale Statistics.....	51
3.10.3. Tests Of Normality	52
3.10.4. Factor Analyzes	54
3.10.4.1. Factor Analysiss For Toxic Leadership (TI).....	54
3.10.4.2. Factor Analysis For Servant Leadership Behavior (Slb)	56
3.10.4.3. Factor Analysis For Individual Performance (Ip).....	58
3.10.5. Correlation Between Leadership Style (Servant Leadership Behavior And Toxic Leadership) And Individual Performance	60
3.10.6. Predicated Effect Of Leadership Styles (Servant Leadership Behavior And Toxic Leadership) And Individual Performance	61
3.10.7. Analysis Of Leadership Styles And Individual Performance Level.....	63

3.10.8. Level Toxic Leadership According To Gender	64
3.10.9. Level Servant Leadership Behavior According To Gender	65
3.10.10. Level Of Individual Performance According To Gender	66
3.10.11. Level Of Toxic Leadership According To Age	67
3.10.12. Level Of Servant Leadership Behavior According To Age	68
3.10.13. Level Of Individual Performance According To Age	69
3.10.14. Level Of Toxic Leadership According To Professional Experience	70
3.10.15. Level Of Servant Leadership Behavior According To Professional Experience	71
3.10.16. Individual Performance According To Professional Experience	72
3.10.17. Level Of Toxic Leadership According To Academic Qualification	73
3.10.18. Level Of Servant Leadership Behavior According To Academic Qualification	74
3.10.19. Level Of Individual Performance According To Academic Qualification	75
3.11 Results Of Hypothesis Tests	76
CONCLUSION	77
REFERENCES.....	83
ANNEXURE 1: QUESTIONNAIRE	97
ANNEXURE 2: ETİK KURULU KARARLARI	99

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.....	Page
Table 3.1: Sample Of Research	47
Table 3.2: The Value Of Cronbach`S Alpha Based On Reliability Statistics	50
Table 3.3: The Value Of Cronbach`S Alpha Based On Scale Statistics.....	51
Table 3.4: Skewness And Kurtosis Of Variables	53
Table 3.5: KMO And Bartlett's Test	54
Table 3.6: Total Variance Explained	55
Table 3.7: Component Matrix ^a For Toxic Leadership (TL)	56
Table 3.8: KMO And Bartlett's Test	56
Table 3.9: Total Variance Explained	57
Table 3.10: Component Matrix ^a For Servant Leadership Behavior (SLB)	58
Table 3.11: KMO And Bartlett's Test	58
Table 3.12: Total Variance Explained	59
Table 3.13: Component Matrix ^a For Individual Performance (IP).....	59
Table 3.14: Correlation Between Leadership Style (Servant Leadership Behavior And Toxic Leadership) And Individual Performance	60
Table 3.15: Predicated Effect Of Toxic Leadership On The Individual Performance	62
Table 3.16: Predicated Effect Of Servant Leadership Behavior On The Individual Performance	62
Table 3.17: Level Of Leadership Style And Individual Performance	63
Table 3.18: Level Toxic Leadership According To Gender	65
Table 3.19: Level Servant Leadership Behavior According To Gender	65
Table 3.20: Level Of Individual Performance According To Gender	66
Table 3.21: Level Of Toxic Leadership According To Age ANOVA Results.....	67
Table 3.22: Level Of Servant Leadership Behavior According To Age ANOVA Results ..	68
Table 3.23: Level Of Individual Performance According To Age ANOVA Results.....	69
Table 3.24: Level Of Toxic Leadership According To Professional Experience ANOVA Results.....	70
Table 3.25: Level Of Servant Leadership Behavior According To Professional Experience ANOVA Results	71
Table 3.26: Level Of Individual Performance According To Professional Experience ANOVA Results	72
Table 3.27: Level Of Toxic Leadership According To Academic Qualification ANOVA Results.....	73
Table 3.28: Level Of Servant Leadership Behavior According To Academic Qualification ANOVA Results	74
Table 3.29: Level Of Individual Performance According To Academic Qualification	75

Table 3.30: Test Hypothesis	76
-----------------------------------	----



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No	Page
Figure 1.1: Some Characteristics Of Leaders	21
Figure 1.2: Difference Between Leadership And Management	23



INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a cornerstone of organizational success, exerting a profound influence on strategic direction, operational efficiency, and employee engagement. It is widely regarded as the ability to guide, inspire, and influence individuals or groups toward the achievement of shared goals (Hersey et al., 1979). Effective leadership involves not only motivating and managing teams but also addressing complex challenges, adapting to change, and making informed decisions that align with organizational objectives (Robbins & Judge, 2022).

The socio-economic landscape of Northern Iraq presents a unique and compelling context for studying leadership. Organizations in this region operate in a dynamic and often unpredictable environment characterized by economic volatility, political instability, and cultural diversity. These challenges require leaders to adopt adaptive and culturally informed practices to ensure organizational resilience and growth. Despite the growing recognition of leadership's importance, limited research exists on the relationship between leadership styles and organizational performance, particularly individual employee performance, within the Northern Iraqi context. This study aims to address this gap by examining how two contrasting leadership styles—servant leadership and toxic leadership—influence key performance indicators.

This research offers both theoretical and practical contributions. Theoretically, it enhances the understanding of how these leadership styles function within the specific context of Northern Iraqi organizations, enriching the academic discourse on leadership in culturally and economically complex environments. Practically, the research provides actionable recommendations for leaders and managers seeking to optimize their management processes and foster high-performing, resilient organizations. As recent studies indicate, leaders who adopt adaptive strategies are better equipped to navigate uncertainties and achieve sustainable growth (Buil et al., 2019). By addressing the specific challenges faced by businesses in Northern Iraq,

this study offers insights that are both academically significant and practically relevant.

This study focuses on two contrasting leadership paradigms: servant leadership, often viewed as a constructive approach, and toxic leadership, which is widely considered a destructive style with negative implications for corporate productivity and organizational performance. By analyzing these opposing styles, the research aims to provide a clearer understanding of the behaviors that drive or hinder success in the workplace.

In conclusion, leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping organizational outcomes and fostering resilience. This research seeks to underscore its importance by analyzing how different leadership styles influence individual performance in the challenging landscape of Northern Iraq. By bridging theoretical gaps and providing practical solutions, this study offers valuable insights for leaders, managers, and policymakers striving to create adaptive and high-performing organizations capable of thriving in complex environments.

1.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

Q1: How does servant leadership influence individual employee performance in business companies in Northern Iraq?

Q2: How does toxic leadership influence individual employee performance in business companies in Northern Iraq?

Q3: To what extent does servant leadership contribute to achieving organizational goals compared to toxic leadership?

1.2 IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The significance of this study lies in its examination of leadership styles and their effects on individual performance, particularly within Northern Iraqi businesses. Effective leadership is vital for the success and sustainability of organizations, especially in competitive and dynamic markets.

By analyzing servant and toxic leadership styles, this research seeks to identify how these approaches impact key performance indicators. Given the specific socio-economic challenges faced by businesses in this region, it is crucial to understand which leadership strategies can foster a competitive and sustainable environment.

This study fills an important gap in the literature by concentrating on culturally influenced leadership behaviors and their impact on organizational success. It offers practical insights for business leaders, helping them develop adaptive strategies that boost productivity, innovation, and resilience.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- Find out correlation between servant, toxic leadership style and individual performance.
- Find out level of servant, toxic leadership style and individual performance according to gender, age, professional experience.
- Find out predicted effect of servant and toxic leadership style on the individual performance.

1.4. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY:

H01: There is a correlation between Toxic Leadership, servant leadership and individual performance.

H02: There is a significant effect of leadership different styles on individual performance.

H03: There is a significant effect of servant leadership on individual performance.

H04: There is a significant difference in the level of Toxic Leadership according to gender.

H05: There is a significant difference in the level of servant leadership behavior according to gender.

H06: There is a significant difference in the level of individual Performance according to gender.

1.5. STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH

The study is systematically organized into five chapters to thoroughly explore leadership decision-making and its influence on organizational performance.

Chapter One provides an introduction, detailing the research questions, study significance, objectives, hypotheses, and the overall organization of the research.

Chapter Two offers a reviews leadership theories, including trait, behavioral, contingency, transactional, transformational, and modern approaches, with a focus on servant and toxic leadership. It also covers the key characteristics of leaders and distinguishes leadership from management.

Chapter Three examines individual performance and organizational performance, defining its elements, dimensions, and types. It discusses the factors affecting individual performance, particularly the influence of leadership styles like servant and toxic leadership, and offers strategies to enhance performance.

Chapter Four include data analysis, a presentation of the findings, and recommendations aimed at enhancing leadership practices in organizations. This structured framework ensures a comprehensive and logical investigation of the research subject.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. LEADERSHIP

Defining leadership is a complex undertaking; as Murray and Chua (2015) aptly note, it is a concept we intuitively understand yet struggle to articulate with precision. Fundamentally, leadership is centered on the process of social influence. A classic definition by Hersey et al. (1979) describes it as "the process of influencing the activities of individuals or groups to achieve a goal." This notion of influence is a recurring theme in the field. Yukl (2009), for instance, views leadership as the ability to persuade and guide individuals toward accomplishing shared objectives. Similarly, Robbins and Judge (2022) define it as "the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of a vision or set of goals." Vroom and Jago (2007) further assert that influence is a central element in nearly all leadership definitions, highlighting the leader's impact on the thoughts and actions of others.

Expanding on this foundation, other scholars introduce additional dimensions to the concept. Bass (1990) characterizes leadership as a dynamic interaction between a leader and followers, where the leader's role is to organize or restructure the situation to meet collective needs. Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik (1961) describe it as an interpersonal stimulation designed to achieve a specific goal through direct communication. From a different angle in his scholarly work, Northouse (2018) presents leadership as a multifaceted process encompassing the ability to guide and inspire. Maloş (2011) also frames leadership as a social influence process where an individual secures the necessary support and assistance from others to accomplish a shared task.

The inspirational and motivational aspects of leadership are particularly emphasized in the works of several influential theorists. Burns (1978) famously described leadership as a relationship between leaders and followers that is so powerful it ultimately transforms both parties. Barker (2001) offers a similar transformative perspective, viewing leadership as a vehicle for integrating individual ethics into the

community to foster social development. In a more practical sense, Kouzes and Posner (2017) argue that leadership is "the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations" and outline five core activities for leaders: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart.

Within an organizational framework, the leader's role is indispensable for success. Leadership is critical for creating a clear vision and mission, establishing goals, and formulating the strategies needed to achieve them efficiently (Xu et al., 2008). When faced with drastic shifts in the external environment, it falls upon senior leadership to adapt the company's vision and ensure its survival and relevance (Harris et al., 2007). In this context, House et al. (2004) define leadership as the ability to control, inspire, and enable others to contribute to the organization's effectiveness. Thus, a successful leader is often described as someone who not only has a clear vision but also possesses the skills to empower others, exercise good intuition, and communicate effectively (Ramamoorthy, 2019). This involves selecting, training, and guiding a diverse team toward the organization's mission with a sense of collective enthusiasm (Winston et al., 2006; Karnes et al., 1993). This comprehensive view underscores that leadership is far more than mere management; it is a catalyst for transformative change.

1.2. LEADERSHIP THEORIES

Leadership is a multifaceted concept centered on influence and goal achievement. Chaurasia and Shukla (2013) define a leader as someone who possesses the ability to inspire, direct, or persuade a sizable group of people to carry out their directives and desires in order to accomplish a shared objective. The evolution of leadership studies throughout the 20th and 21st centuries has produced numerous frameworks for understanding this process. Among the most influential are the six core principles of modern leadership identified by Bass and Bass (2008) in their seminal work, *The*

Bass Handbook of Leadership. These principles assert that leadership: (1) facilitates excellence in others; (2) is the mastery of anticipating, initiating, and implementing change; (3) is no longer the exclusive domain of the top boss; (4) is not the same as management; (5) requires leaders to take a holistic approach, applying a difference of skills, qualities, and capabilities; and (6) has a sensitive, humanistic dimension. Leadership theories provide more specific frameworks and models for understanding its nature and effectiveness.

1.2.1 Trait Theory

The development of leadership theories began with trait theories in the early 20th century, which focus on the individual and personal characteristics of the leader (Robbins, 2005). This perspective argues that leadership qualities are innate rather than learned, meaning one either possesses them or does not (Mullins, 2005). Early scholars believed that certain inborn characteristics were evident in successful leaders. Stogdill's (1948) comprehensive review, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership," provided a foundational analysis of this research, detailing the specific traits associated with effective leadership. These traits include a range of skills, beliefs, and personality characteristics that contribute to superior performance (McShane et al., 2000). According to Majumdar (2011), trait theories help individuals recognize useful leadership characteristics, which together form a general style incorporating sensitivity, assertiveness, decisive decision-making, and accountability. Additionally, Mullins (2005) identifies self-confidence, initiative, maturity, and trust in one's actions as key leadership traits. Turner (1999) further pinpointed seven key traits for effective project managers: problem-solving skills, a focus on results, energy and initiative, self-confidence, a broad perspective, and the ability to collaborate and negotiate, suggesting leaders with these traits are more likely to succeed.

1.2.2 Behavioral Theory

Behavioral theories emerged in response to the limitations of trait theories. Rather than focusing on inherent traits, this school of thought posits that effective leadership is determined by specific, observable behaviors (Adair, 1983; Hershey & Blanchard, 1988). This suggests that leadership skills can be developed and learned. Blake and Mouton's (1964) "The Managerial Grid," for example, divides leadership behavior into different styles based on two primary dimensions: concern for people and concern for production. This perspective highlights that successful leaders exhibit key behavioral patterns, such as showing respect for individuals, fostering positive relationships, demonstrating concern for achieving production goals, exercising authority appropriately, actively involving team members in decision-making, and balancing consistency with the enforcement of rules.

1.2.3 Contingency Theory

The contingency theories of leadership, which became popular in the 1970s, represented a necessary departure from earlier trait and behavioral theories by emphasizing the role of situational factors. These theories hold that leadership effectiveness is not based on a single style but depends on various contextual factors (Fiedler, 1967, p. 101). The central idea is that an effective leader's approach must adapt to the situation at hand (House, 1971). Fiedler (1967) introduced one of the earliest contingency models in his "Theory of Leadership Effectiveness," suggesting that effective leadership depends on the alignment of leadership style and situational favorableness. The contingency school of thought explores a leader's orientation through three main dimensions: assessing the leader's traits, evaluating the situation's key factors, and finding the right balance between the leader and the current situation. One of the most common contingency models is the Path-Goal Theory, which posits

that leaders must guide their team towards achieving goals and provide the necessary support along the way (House, 1971).

1.2.4 Transactional and Transformational Leadership

The concepts of transactional and transformational leadership were notably explored and expanded upon by Bass and Riggio (2006). They adeptly distinguished between these two influential styles.

A transformational leader is recognized for their exceptional capacity to foster innovation and facilitate change (Daft, 2006). This style focuses on inspiration and motivation. Transformational leadership is defined by four essential elements, commonly known as 'The Four I's': Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

In contrast, transactional leadership involves leaders who clarify roles and task expectations, guiding and motivating their followers towards specific objectives through a system of rewards and penalties (Robbins, 2005). The primary emphasis of transactional leadership lies in the interactions and exchanges between leaders and their subordinates (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985, 1990, 2000, 2008). Transactional leadership comprises four main components: contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and laissez-faire leadership (Bass, 2009).

1.2.5. Modern Theories

Exploring contemporary leadership theories is essential for navigating the intricate landscapes of modern organizational settings. Leadership, as a process of influence towards a common objective (Yukl, 2010), is manifested through a leader's 'style'—a

term characterized by Blake and Mouton (1964) as a "relatively stable" set of behaviors (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). The chosen leadership philosophy significantly impacts project outcomes, with its effectiveness being highly dependent on the circumstances (Khan et al., 2012). A leader's style determines how they guide, plan, and motivate, requiring a combination of physical presence (e.g., confidence, adaptability), intellectual aptitude for problem-solving, and social awareness to be effective (Jing et al., 2013). Highlighting the importance of adaptability, Goleman (2000) identified six leadership styles, emphasizing that understanding and applying these approaches is crucial for overcoming obstacles and achieving success. The following sections delve into several prominent modern leadership styles.

1.2.5.1 Authentic Leadership

Avolio and Gardner (2005) introduced the compelling concept of authentic leadership in their work on "Authentic Leadership Development." This perspective emphasizes vital qualities such as self-awareness, transparency, and ethical decision-making. Authentic leadership is characterized by genuine, ethical, and self-aware behavior, with leaders who are deeply rooted in their core values and act in accordance with them. This approach promotes relational transparency through open communication and trust-building, while decisions are guided by an internal moral compass rather than external pressures (Gardner, 2021). It is particularly valuable in contemporary organizations where trust and ethical standards are paramount, especially during periods of transformation or crisis. While it has faced some conceptual criticisms, its proven ability to enhance team cohesion, employee satisfaction, and organizational resilience has solidified its significance in leadership studies.

1.2.5.2 Situational Leadership

Pioneered by Hersey and Blanchard (1969) and later refined in their work "Management of Organizational Behavior," the Situational Leadership Theory posits that effective leadership hinges on adaptability. This theory suggests that there is no single best leadership style; instead, a leader's approach must align with the "readiness" or developmental stage of their followers. This flexible model requires leaders to adjust their behavior along a continuum of directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating based on follower competence and commitment, as well as task complexity (Hersey et al., 1969). Empirical studies have supported this model, showing that leaders who adapt their style to fit the situation achieve better team performance and higher employee satisfaction compared to those with a rigid approach (Thompson et al., 2009). This dynamic framework offers leaders a practical structure for handling diverse workplace scenarios and enhancing team outcomes.

1.2.5.3 Autocratic Leadership Style

The autocratic leadership style is defined by centralized decision-making and absolute authority. According to Rosenfeld and Plax (1975), authoritarian leaders make decisions without consulting others, relying solely on their own judgment and authority. Control is often maintained through force, threats, or a system of rewards, regardless of whether a clear vision is present. Their actions and decisions are based entirely on their own opinions, with little to no consideration for the perspectives of their subordinates. Research findings suggest that this approach can instill feelings of fear and distrust among team members, leading them to guard their attitudes and mistrust the motives of others (Bhatti et al., 2012). Institutions characterized by authoritarian styles tend to prioritize rigid orderliness over personal relationships, creating an environment where individuals operate in protected, isolated circles (Gonos et al., 2013). Consequently, this style has faced significant criticism, with

studies indicating that organizations led by autocratic leaders often experience higher employee turnover and absenteeism (Hackman et al., 2009).

1.2.5.4 Paternalistic Leadership Style

Paternalistic leadership is described by Aycan (2007) as a hierarchical control system that mirrors a "father-son" relationship, blending authority with benevolence. In this system, the leader acts as a paternal figure, taking personal interest in the professional and sometimes personal well-being of their subordinates. Max Weber's (1968) early work introduced paternalism as a form of legitimized power within society, identifying it as a type of traditional dominance characterized by patriarchal authority. This style can be complex, as it requires the leader to balance discipline with care, creating a family-like atmosphere within the workplace while maintaining organizational objectives. Successful paternalistic leaders are adept at leveraging the "paternal transference" of their employees, where subordinates view the leader with a degree of familial respect and loyalty.

1.2.5.5 Charismatic Leadership Style

Charismatic leadership centers on the leader's exceptional ability to inspire and motivate followers to perform beyond expectations (Daft, 2006). This style is often associated with leaders who possess a revolutionary power to change the values and beliefs of their followers (Harwiki, 2016). According to Michael (2010), a charismatic leader typically possesses a strong, well-defined vision, is able to articulate that vision effectively, and exhibits unwavering consistency and focus. Their personal magnetism and compelling communication skills enable them to energize and mobilize every team member toward achieving shared objectives, often leading to high levels of commitment and performance.

1.2.5.6 Bureaucratic Leadership Style

Bureaucratic leaders are known for their strong commitment to established rules, procedures, and maintaining order. They lead strictly "by the book," ensuring that every task is performed precisely as outlined in official policies. For these leaders, consistency, compliance, and predictability are top priorities. Employees under bureaucratic leadership are expected to adhere closely to guidelines, with minimal room for flexibility or improvisation. If a situation arises that is not covered by existing rules, the leader typically refers the issue to a higher authority rather than making an independent decision. As noted by Hackman and Johnson (2009), this approach can be effective in highly regulated or hazardous environments where precision is essential, but it can also stifle creativity, slow responsiveness, and diminish employee morale in more dynamic settings.

1.2.5.7 Laissez-Faire Leadership Style

Positioned at the opposite end of the spectrum from autocratic leadership, the laissez-faire style is characterized by a hands-off approach. As described by Bass (1994), leaders adopting this style delegate most, if not all, decision-making authority to their subordinates, resulting in a high degree of group freedom and autonomy. This approach often stems from the leader's lack of confidence or reluctance to take charge, leading to a loosely structured team where leadership is inconsistent or entirely absent. In such environments, roles and responsibilities can become unclear, leading to confusion and slow, inefficient decision-making. Without clear direction, internal friction may arise, and outcomes are often suboptimal. While this style might function in niche contexts with highly skilled and self-motivated experts, it generally fails to provide the focus and coordination necessary for most teams to thrive.

1.2.5.8 Democratic (or Participative) Leadership Style

Democratic leaders highly value their team members, viewing them as crucial partners in achieving institutional goals. This style is characterized by shared decision-making, where leaders actively involve subordinates in the process (Foels et al., 2000). They encourage staff to contribute to shaping the organization's vision and direction, allowing everyone to share their perspectives on work-related matters (Kaner, 2014). This inclusive approach fosters a sense of trust and empowerment, which in turn leads to greater cooperation, teamwork, and increased morale (Hackman & Johnson, 2009, p. 44). While the ultimate decision may still rest with the leader, the delegation of authority is respected. Research suggests that employees working under such leadership are often highly motivated and perform their tasks with greater efficiency and quality (Paliszkiewicz et al., 2017).

1.3 SERVANT AND TOXIC LEADERSHIP STYLES

This study focuses on two diametrically opposed leadership paradigms: servant leadership and toxic leadership. Servant leadership is characterized by a leader's primary focus on serving others, fostering an environment of trust, empowerment, and ethical behavior. This approach is consistently linked to positive outcomes such as increased employee performance, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors, and creativity across diverse cultural contexts (Eva et al., 2019; Van Dierendonck, 2011). As noted by Saleem et al. (2020), this style emphasizes humility, authenticity, and the development of strong, trust-based relationships, making it particularly effective for mentoring and enhancing work engagement. Consequently, servant leadership is increasingly viewed as a constructive alternative to traditional hierarchical or destructive approaches, promoting healthier and more sustainable organizational cultures (Milošević, 2020; Van Dierendonck, 2011).

In stark contrast, toxic leadership involves destructive behaviors aimed at maintaining personal control and concealing incompetence, often resulting in ambiguity, confusion, and significant harm to both organizational performance and employee well-being (Milošević, 2020). While toxic leaders may not always intend direct harm, they create environments that systematically undermine productivity and morale. However, it is also important to recognize that followers are not passive victims; they can actively resist or neutralize such negative influences, demonstrating their agency within the organizational dynamic.

1.3.1 Servant Leadership Style

The concept of "servant leadership," first introduced by Robert Greenleaf in the 1970s, describes a leader whose primary motivation is to serve the needs of their team (Greenleaf, 2002). This philosophy is rooted in a cooperative approach where the leader actively involves individuals in decision-making, addresses problems collaboratively, and aims for consensus. To be effective, a servant leader must cultivate an environment of trust and collaboration while forgoing the inclination for personal authority or dominance (Moore & Rudd, 2006).

At its core, servant leadership is a holistic approach that nurtures followers on multiple levels (Relationally, ethically, emotionally, and spiritually) helping them reach their full potential. This is driven by a leader's genuine sense of care and moral responsibility (Greenleaf, 1977). When people feel valued and supported, they naturally become more engaged and effective. Servant leaders view themselves as stewards of their organizations, ensuring that all resources, both human and financial, are cultivated and used wisely for the greater good (van Dierendonck, 2011). While deeply invested in the personal development of their followers, they do not neglect performance expectations. Unlike styles that prioritize profits at the expense of people, servant leadership recognizes that sustainable success stems from empowering individuals, not exploiting them (Sendjaya, 2015).

Robert Greenleaf (2005) powerfully articulated the essence of this philosophy through two profound questions: "Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?" He further clarified that the defining characteristic of a true servant-leader is their initial, innate inclination to serve. From this foundation, leadership emerges as a conscious choice. He contrasted this with the "leader-first" individual, who is driven by a desire for power and control. The servant-first leader, in contrast, ensures that the highest-priority needs of others are met, thereby fostering a culture of care, empowerment, and shared growth (Greenleaf, 1991).

Patterson (2003) provided a structured framework by outlining seven virtuous constructs that define servant leadership: love (agapao), humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. This framework highlights the ethical and moral foundation of the style. The importance of trust is a recurring theme. As Maxwell (1998) famously asserted, "Trust is the foundation of leadership." Blanchard (2007) reinforces this by describing servant leaders as humble individuals who prioritize others' well-being over their own ego, understanding that true power is a tool for service, not domination. This humility is crucial for earning the cooperation of followers. A leader must connect with their followers' hearts before asking for their commitment, a principle that is especially critical in challenging times (Maxwell, 1998).

As the world becomes increasingly complex, the need for dynamic and adaptive leadership is paramount. Servant leadership, by emphasizing the value of individuals, offers a stark contrast to traditional, autocratic styles and fosters positive organizational change (Brewer, 2010). Research consistently shows that when leaders prioritize their followers, performance levels rise (Braham, 1999). This style promotes integrity and positive relationships through selflessness and consideration, creating a strong sense of community guided by moral principles (Greenleaf, 1977). Servant leaders encourage both organizational achievements and broader societal contributions (Suheyb, 2024), and this approach has even been proposed as a

safeguard against workplace bullying and a tool for building employee resilience (Ahmad et al., 2021). As Saleem et al. (2020) note, it involves leading alongside followers in a collaborative environment where tolerance, gratitude, and compassion thrive. While Norhouse (2019) questions how a leader can both serve and influence simultaneously, it is this unique paradox that distinguishes servant leadership, grounding it in ethical values and shared power (Spears, 2010b; Eva et al., 2019).

1.3.2 Toxic Leadership Style

Toxic leadership has become a significant concern in organizational studies due to its devastating effects on individuals and systems. Rooted in personal dysfunction and destructive professional conduct, toxic leaders create lasting harm. Lipman-Blumen's model describes this phenomenon as a combination of harmful behaviors and personal pathologies that inflict damage on employees and the institutions they serve (as cited in Heppell, 2011). These leaders cultivate environments of fear, anxiety, and insecurity, undermining the psychological safety essential for growth. The consequences are not confined to individual actions; they permeate the entire organizational system. Unchecked toxic behaviors become embedded in cultural norms, decision-making processes, and performance expectations (Roter, 2011). This systemic decay is possible because organizational behavior is influenced by a complex network of interdependent factors, including leader-follower dynamics, structural systems, and cultural dimensions (Pelletier, 2009). Toxicity thrives where safeguards like ethical governance and open communication are weak.

Toxic leadership manifests in various forms, including psychological abuse, emotional manipulation, and a chronic disregard for employee well-being. Common behaviors include excessive micromanagement, public criticism, deflection of blame, and imposing unmanageable workloads. Some toxic leaders even claim credit for their subordinates' accomplishments while simultaneously belittling their efforts, systematically eroding morale and trust (Heppell, 2011). This can normalize

workplace bullying and systemic injustice. The impact on mental health is severe; for example, a study by Hadadian (2016) found that toxic leadership accounted for 42% of the variance in job-related stress among knowledge workers.

Descriptions of toxic leaders have evolved, with Flynn (1999) vividly portraying them as bullies who use intimidation and emotional volatility to control others. Under their influence, workplaces often devolve into environments of fear and disengagement, where employees withhold honest communication. This damage extends beyond suppressing performance; it dismantles organizational integrity. Employees face a choice: conform or leave. Those who stay may internalize these destructive behaviors, perpetuating a cycle of dysfunction (Wilson-Starks, 2003). The metaphor of termites eating away at a wooden structure is apt; while the organization may appear stable, its internal foundations are deteriorating.

The corrosive impact on organizational culture is particularly troubling. Aubrey (2012) highlights how toxic leaders undermine shared values and erode intrinsic motivation. This is especially damaging in innovation-driven industries where collaboration is key. Furthermore, toxic behaviors normalize incivility and favoritism, creating a climate where such practices are tolerated. Wilson-Starks (2016) argues that these leaders suppress innovation by exercising excessive control, viewing power as domination rather than empowerment.

Addressing toxic leadership requires systemic interventions beyond temporary disciplinary actions. Some institutions, like the military, have begun implementing corrective strategies such as enhanced screening, mandatory leadership training, and robust feedback systems. In conclusion, toxic leadership poses a significant threat to organizational health and long-term viability. Acknowledging it as both a personal and an organizational problem is the first step toward developing comprehensive strategies to counter its effects. For businesses in Northern Iraq and beyond, addressing this issue is a strategic imperative for sustaining performance and preserving cultural integrity.

1.4. CHARACTERISTICS OF LEADERS

According a follow table, different attributes of leaders are listed to help senior managers choose the most appropriate leaders for their organization and strategic goals. The table includes details on Physical Characteristics, Personality Traits, Work-Related Characteristics, Tenacity, Intelligence, Ability, Social Characteristics, and Social Background to provide a better understanding of various leadership styles. (Daft, 2006). Extensive research has been conducted on the qualities of successful leaders, uncovering a intricate combination of characteristics, abilities, and actions that lead to effective leadership. Studies show that emotional intelligence is a key trait that allows leaders to effectively comprehend and control both their own emotions and the emotions of their followers (Goleman et al., 2013). Leaders need strong strategic thinking and decision-making skills to effectively handle complex organizational challenges and uphold a long-term vision, according to Yukl & Gardner (2020). Current studies on leadership highlight the significance of being adaptable and resilient, especially in the fast-changing business environment of today where leaders need to successfully handle change and uncertainty (Day & Antonakis, 2018).

Moreover, demonstrating ethical behavior and moral courage are important traits, as research has indicated that leaders who exhibit strong ethical values are able to foster greater trust and commitment within organizations (Brown & Treviño, 2016). Recent studies also emphasize the increasing significance of cultural intelligence and digital literacy as essential attributes for leaders in today's globalized and technologically advanced environments (Northouse, 2021). This in-depth knowledge of leadership traits offers a structure for cultivating successful leaders within contemporary companies.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LEADERS	
Physical Characteristics • Energy • Physical stamina	Personality • Self-confidence • Honesty and integrity • Enthusiasm • Desire to lead • Independence
Intelligence and Ability • Intelligence, cognitive ability • Knowledge • Judgment, decisiveness	Social Characteristics • Sociability, interpersonal skills • Cooperativeness • Ability to enlist cooperation • Tact, diplomacy
Work-Related Characteristics • Achievement drive, desire to excel • Conscientiousness in pursuit of goals • Persistence against obstacles, tenacity	Social Background • Education • Mobility

Source: Daft, 2006: 662

Figure 1.1: Some Characteristics of Leaders

This Figure (**Figure No. 1.1**), taken from Daft (2006), neatly organizes the different personal traits of leaders into six sections. Starting with Physical Characteristics, which includes things like having good energy and stamina. Personality traits are next, highlighting self-confidence, enthusiasm, a desire to lead, honesty, and independence. Moving on, Work-Related Characteristics focus on the drive to achieve, being conscientious, and persistence. Under Intelligence and Ability, it includes cognitive skills, knowledge, judgment, and decisiveness. Social Characteristics cover being sociable, cooperative, and diplomatic. Finally, Social Background takes into account education and mobility. This well-rounded table gives a clear picture of the diverse qualities that make an effective leader.

1.5. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

While leadership and management are interconnected, they fulfill different roles within organizations. As noted by (Robbins and Coulter, 2017) in their work 'Management,' management focuses on the planning, organization, and control of resources to meet organizational objectives, prioritizing efficiency and structure. Conversely, Robbins (2005) asserts that leadership is primarily concerned with navigating change, whereas management addresses the challenges of complexity.

On this very subject (Bennis and Nanus, 1985) argue in "Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge" that leaders focus on people, inspiring and aligning them with a vision, while managers focus on processes, ensuring tasks are executed efficiently. This perspective is echoed by (Kotter, 1990) in "A Force for Change," who emphasizes that leadership is about coping with change, whereas management is about coping with complexity. Also (Mintzberg, 1973) argues in "The Nature of Managerial Work" that while management involves planning, organizing, and controlling, leadership is about inspiring and setting direction. Leaders and managers, as (Drucker, 2008) notes in "Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices," complement each other, with effective organizations recognizing and balancing the need for both roles. In a similar vein, (Bennis, 1989) articulated in his Essentials that 'an institution is very well managed and very poorly led'. This statement underscores the distinction yet interdependence between management and leadership. For organizations to enhance their performance, both managerial and leadership roles are essential. Kotter further elucidates the contrast between management and leadership by identifying the primary functions of management. He posits that modern management can be characterized in various ways, yet four fundamental processes—planning, budgeting, organizing, and controlling—are universally recognized. Additionally, (Kotter, 1988) delineates three core activities that differentiate management from leadership: the initial creation of an agenda, the subsequent development of a human network to support the agenda, and finally, the execution of that agenda.

LEADER QUALITIES	MANAGER QUALITIES
Soul	Mind
Visionary	Rational
Passionate	Consulting
Creative	Persistent
Flexible	Problem solving
Inspiring	Thought-minded
Innovative	Analytical
Courageous	Structured
Imaginative	Deliberate
Experimental	Authoritative
Initiates change	Stabilizing
Personal power	Position power

Figure 1.2: Difference between Leadership and Management
Source: Daft (2006)

This table (**Figure No. 1.2**), from Daft (2006), compares the qualities of leaders and managers. Leaders are depicted with traits like vision, passion, creativity, flexibility, inspiration, innovation, courage, imagination, experimentation, and a capacity to initiate change, which emphasizes their role in driving personal influence and transformation within an organization. Managers, conversely, are associated with rationality, consultation, persistence, problem-solving, analytical thinking, structured approaches, deliberation, authority, stabilization, and positional power. This comparison highlights the distinct characteristics that differentiate leaders from managers, underscoring the unique roles and approaches each brings to an organization, fostering both innovative and stable environments.

1.6. LEADERSHIP IN EMERGING ECONOMIES

Leadership, in its broadest sense, is the process of influencing individuals and groups toward shared objectives within a given environment. It involves developing a vision, facilitating collective action, and navigating complexities to achieve desired outcomes (Baporikar, 2017). While foundational leadership models like transformational, charismatic, and democratic styles have provided alternatives to traditional command-and-control approaches, the unique context of emerging economies demands a more nuanced understanding. In these environments, leadership is not merely about managing an organization but about shaping its trajectory amidst profound and continuous change (Baporikar, 2022).

Emerging economies, such as that of Iraq, are characterized by a unique combination of rapid industrialization, market liberalization, and evolving institutional frameworks (Khanna & Palepu, 2010; Ardichvili & Dirani, 2017). These markets represent a growing share of global economic activity but are simultaneously marked by significant volatility and uncertainty compared to their developed counterparts (Hoskisson et al., 2013). Leaders operating within these contexts face a formidable set of challenges that profoundly influence their practices.

A defining feature of these markets is the presence of "institutional voids"—gaps or deficiencies in the formal institutions that typically support market functions. As described by Kebede et al. (2024), these voids include unreliable contract enforcement, underdeveloped financial systems, inconsistent regulatory oversight, and infrastructural deficits. Such gaps increase transaction costs, amplify uncertainty, and force leaders to operate in an environment where the formal "rules of the game" are either unclear or untrustworthy. Consequently, leadership practices must adapt to compensate for these institutional weaknesses.

Furthermore, the socio-political fabric of emerging economies is often complex and dynamic. Unstable political landscapes, shifting regulatory mechanisms and the prevalence of informal institutional practices mean that success often depends heavily

on personal relationships and networks (Javed et al., 2024). The human resource profile is also distinct, often comprising a young, diverse, and increasingly digital-native workforce that may simultaneously face significant gaps in education and skills (Qu et al., 2024). This complex interplay of institutional fragility, political dynamism, and human capital challenges necessitates a leadership approach that is strategically agile, culturally intelligent, and exceptionally resilient.

Given the specific challenges of emerging economies like Iraq, the choice of leadership style carries amplified consequences. The contrasting paradigms of servant and toxic leadership offer a powerful lens through which to analyze what fosters success versus what precipitates failure in such environments.

Servant Leadership as a Stabilizing Force: In a context defined by low trust in formal institutions, the principles of servant leadership become a potent strategic tool. The servant leader's emphasis on empathy, ethical behavior, and prioritizing the well-being of stakeholders (Eva et al., 2019; Greenleaf, 1977) can effectively build "relational contracts." These trust-based relationships with employees, suppliers, and community members can substitute for weak legal protections, creating a stable ecosystem for the organization. By fostering a culture of trust and psychological safety, servant leaders empower employees to take initiative and innovate—critical capabilities for navigating a volatile market (Patterson, 2003). In Iraq, where social and community ties are paramount, a leader who is perceived as a genuine servant can build immense social capital, unlocking access to resources and support that would otherwise be unavailable. This style directly addresses the need for a humanistic, people-centric approach, making employees feel valued and secure amidst external chaos.

Toxic Leadership as a Catalyst for Collapse: Conversely, a toxic leadership style is particularly devastating in this same context. Behaviors rooted in narcissism, blame-shifting, and control (as cited in Heppell, 2011) are poison to an environment that already suffers from uncertainty. Where formal rules are weak, trust is the only currency; a toxic leader who erodes that trust dismantles the organization's most

critical asset. In a setting like Iraq, where networks are vital, a toxic leader who alienates employees and external partners will quickly find the organization isolated. The fear and disengagement they cultivate (Hadadian, 2016) paralyze the very creativity and adaptability needed for survival. This style exacerbates the existing "institutional voids" by creating internal voids of communication, collaboration, and morale, accelerating the organization's path toward dysfunction and failure.

The unique pressures of emerging economies have given rise to a heightened focus on responsible leadership. This style, characterized by a commitment to accountability to all stakeholders and a proactive pursuit of positive social impact, is especially relevant (Maak, 2006). In regions facing significant social and environmental challenges—such as poverty, inequality, and resource depletion—leaders hold a pivotal position in advancing sustainable development. This extends beyond mere legal compliance to include actively enhancing societal welfare (Qu et al., 2024).

Responsible leaders in emerging economies often act as agents of change, championing initiatives that benefit both their companies and the broader community (Javed & Qureshi, 2024). By integrating corporate social responsibility (CSR) into their core strategy, they build organizational credibility, foster stakeholder trust, and contribute to long-term business growth and social progress. This approach directly aligns with the principles of servant leadership but frames them within a broader socio-economic context, making it a critical component of successful leadership in markets like Iraq.

To effectively navigate this complex terrain, leaders in emerging economies must cultivate a specific set of advanced competencies, synthesized from the existing literature:

- **Deep Cultural Intelligence (CQ):** In environments where success is heavily reliant on personal relationships and networks, leaders must move beyond superficial awareness to a deep understanding of local values, communication styles, and social

hierarchies. This allows them to build authentic relationships and motivate a diverse workforce effectively (Javed et al., 2024).

- **Strategic Bricolage and Adaptability:** "Bricolage" refers to the art of creatively using limited or unconventional resources to solve problems. In the face of "institutional voids" and infrastructural gaps, leaders must be innovative improvisers, turning constraints into opportunities (Kebede et al., 2024).

- **Mastery of Stakeholder Engagement:** Unlike in developed markets where shareholder primacy often dominates, leaders in emerging economies must skillfully manage a wider web of stakeholders, including government bodies, local communities, and informal networks. Their ability to practice "Responsible Leadership" by balancing these competing interests is crucial for long-term viability (Maak, 2006; Qu et al., 2024).

- **Resilience and Proactive Vision:** The constant rate of change requires leaders who are not merely reactive but can anticipate future shifts and proactively shape their environment. They must inspire their organizations with a compelling vision that provides stability and direction amidst the turbulence, embracing a proactive and entrepreneurial attitude (Baporikar, 2019).

In conclusion, leadership in emerging economies like Iraq is a high-stakes endeavor that demands more than traditional management skills. It requires a sophisticated blend of ethical stewardship, cultural acuity, strategic agility, and a profound commitment to human development. As scholars like Kumar (2007) have noted, leadership is crucial for success, but in these contexts, it is also a fundamental driver of national progress. Therefore, fostering leadership styles like servant and responsible leadership, while actively combating toxicity, is not just an organizational goal—it is a national imperative. Educational institutions play a vital role in this, as they must equip the next generation of leaders with the values and skills needed to build resilient and prosperous societies (Baporikar, 2019).

CHAPTER 2: PERFORMANCE

2.1. DEFINITION AND EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

The concept of performance is a central and enduring topic within organizational studies, attracting continuous scholarly attention from diverse fields such as psychology, human resource management, and marketing (Rasouli, 2020). Its complexity is well-documented; Venkatraman and Ramanujam (1986) noted early dissatisfaction among scholars regarding its conceptual ambiguity. Despite this, understanding performance remains critical for organizational effectiveness. A key insight from Lebas (1995) is that performance is a "case-specific" concept, meaning its definition and metrics must be tailored to the unique context of each organization.

Fundamentally, "performance" refers to the outcomes or objectives an entity seeks to achieve (Mohammed Hanafi, 2010). From an operational standpoint, it can be defined as the ability to transform inputs (e.g., raw materials, labor) into specified outputs efficiently and at the lowest feasible cost (Hanafi Mahmoud Suleiman, 1999). This highlights the dual focus on both effectiveness (achieving goals) and efficiency (optimizing resources).

The terms "performance management" and "performance measurement" are closely related and sometimes used interchangeably in the literature. However, they represent distinct processes. Performance measurement is the process of collecting, analyzing, and reporting data on performance, while performance management uses this data to improve performance. As Franco-Santos et al. (2007) emphasize, measurement systems are the foundation of effective management (cited in Rasouli, 2020). Cokins (2009, p. 9) offers a straightforward view, stating that performance management is ultimately about translating an organization's strategic objectives into intended results (Dalla, 2020). It encompasses the entire cycle of planning, monitoring, and acting to guide the organization toward its goals (Verweire & Van den Berghe, 2004).

To be effective, performance metrics must serve multiple purposes. Spitzer (2007) argues that beyond simply guiding behavior, well-designed metrics should enhance visibility, clarify expectations, promote accountability, augment objectivity, and provide early warning indicators. When properly implemented, such a system can inspire individuals and drive significant organizational improvement.

Performance evaluation, or appraisal, is the formal process of assessing employee performance. According to Omar Wasfi Aqili (1991), this process serves several strategic goals:

- **Strategic Alignment:** It helps ensure that the right person is in the right place by matching employee qualifications and competencies with appropriate tasks, thereby optimizing talent utilization.
- **Supervisory Effectiveness:** It provides supervisors with a structured tool to monitor staff performance, enabling them to offer targeted guidance and support where needed.
- **Motivation and Development:** It aims to raise individual performance levels by clarifying expectations and demonstrating the mutual benefits of improvement for both the individual and the organization.
- **Informing Key Decisions:** The evaluation process provides objective data to support critical human resource decisions, such as identifying candidates for executive roles, determining promotions, and allocating rewards.

2.2. RELEVANCE OF INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE

Individual performance (IP) is widely understood as the contribution employees make toward achieving organizational objectives. It encompasses not only the achievements of individual employees but can also represent the collective accomplishments of teams or departments. Performance evaluation often involves measuring how effectively employees complete their assigned tasks in alignment

with predefined standards or organizational benchmarks (Herbert, 2000). Viewed through this lens, individual performance serves as a cornerstone for organizational success and provides a valuable proxy for assessing overall organizational effectiveness (Afshan et al., 2024). Managing performance typically entails a structured approach, including setting objectives, measuring outcomes, providing feedback, and employing positive reinforcement, all of which are crucial for enhancing employee performance. Research underscores the significance of employee engagement and talent management in driving performance; Smith and Bititci (2017) highlight how engagement fosters commitment, while Mensah emphasizes the growing importance of talent management in today's competitive environment.

Organizations depend heavily on high-performing individuals to meet their strategic objectives and maintain a sustainable competitive advantage. From the employees' perspective, performance carries substantial personal significance. Achieving tasks successfully fosters feelings of satisfaction, mastery, and pride, whereas underperformance can result in dissatisfaction. When individual achievements are recognized, they are frequently rewarded, and while performance alone is not the sole driver of career advancement, it remains a pivotal factor. Empirical evidence suggests that high-performing employees are more likely to secure promotions and access broader career opportunities (Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000).

In management research, individual performance has often been conceptualized as a singular, overarching measure, underpinned by criteria like productivity, sales outcomes, or quality of service (Bingham, 1926; Nagle, 1953). This approach, however, can treat performance as a “black box,” focusing on end results while giving minimal attention to the processes and contextual factors that underpin them (Bailey, 1983). This highlights the need for a more nuanced understanding of the complex dynamics that shape performance.

2.2.1 Factors Influencing Individual Performance

Individual performance is influenced by a multitude of factors that either support or hinder an employee's ability to perform at their best. These factors are a mix of internal, personal characteristics and external, organizational conditions. As noted by Garandai (2021), personal attitudes and values guide how employees approach tasks, while leadership and organizational practices define the environment where performance develops. As Cho et al. (2011) assert, organizational performance begins with individual efforts, which are shaped by these various factors.

2.2.1.1. Internal and Individual-Level Factors

Each employee brings unique qualities to their role that significantly influence performance.

Personal Demographics and Traits: Demographics such as age, gender, and marital status may have subtle effects, while personality traits, innate skills, and cognitive abilities are more direct factors.

Attitudes, Values, and Beliefs: An individual's performance is significantly influenced by their internal state. When employees find their personal values align with the organization's mission, they feel more motivated and committed (Waldman, 1994). This alignment fosters a sense of purpose.

Motivation and Job Satisfaction: A motivated and satisfied employee is far more likely to contribute positively and consistently to the organization's goals (Al-Tit, 2017). A lack of motivation policies or opportunities for development can lead to inconsistent and underwhelming performance.

2.2.1.2. External and Organizational Factors

The environment in which an employee works is a critical determinant of performance. This includes both the immediate internal climate and broader external influences.

Internal Organizational Environment: A supportive internal environment is crucial. This includes a collaborative social atmosphere among colleagues, access to necessary tools and resources, and a positive physical work environment. Fair and transparent systems for supervision, feedback, rewards, and promotions also contribute to stability and trust (Laily et al., 2021). Positive managerial decisions, strong employee retention strategies, and a healthy organizational culture all enhance individual contributions, whereas outdated management practices or weak recruitment systems can have a negative impact (Abbas, 2020; Barrera, Fernández, & Fernández, 2019). Furthermore, an overemphasis on long-term strategy at the expense of short-term needs can lead to burnout and dissatisfaction (Abbas, 2020).

Broader External Factors: Some influences lie outside the organization's direct control but still impact employees. These include wider social and cultural norms, political and legal frameworks, and prevailing economic conditions (Askarany, 2011). Organizations must help employees adapt by creating flexible and responsive work environments.

Among all organizational factors, leadership and direct management practices have the most immediate and powerful impact on individual performance. The following specific actions have been identified in the literature as key drivers:

- **Effective Leadership:** Leaders who provide clarity, support, and recognition foster motivation and high performance. Transformational leadership, in particular, has a proven positive impact on inspiring employees to exceed expectations (Ilgen & Pulakos, 1999).

- **Coaching and Feedback:** Providing regular, constructive feedback and dedicated coaching helps employees improve their skills and refine their performance over time. This continuous loop of communication is essential for development (Tubre et al., 2006).

- **Empowerment and Autonomy:** Employees who are given the freedom to make decisions related to their own work often feel a greater sense of responsibility and motivation. This autonomy is strongly linked to higher job satisfaction and improved output (Viswesvaran, 2002).

- **Participatory Decision-Making:** Involving employees in broader team or organizational decisions fosters a sense of accountability and strengthens their connection to shared goals, which in turn enhances their individual performance (Griffin et al., 2007).

- **Supportive and Trusting Culture:** Creating a workplace with open communication, mutual trust, and a clear alignment between stated values and actual culture is fundamental. Such an environment allows employees to thrive and take calculated risks without fear of unfair reprisal (Fay & Sonnentag, 2010).

- **Motivational Strategies:** Implementing clear and fair systems for incentives—such as financial rewards, public recognition, and tangible career growth opportunities—is a powerful way to encourage and sustain strong individual performance (Schultz et al., 2009).

- **Skill Development and Training:** Investing in training and development programs not only keeps employees' skills competitive and relevant but also signals that the organization values them. This directly improves their output, confidence, and engagement (Fay & Sonnentag, 2010).

2.2.2. Improve Individual Performance

Enhancing individual performance is a strategic imperative for any organization and can be approached through a combination of individual-led initiatives and structured

organizational interventions. At a personal level, performance improvement begins with self-reflection; individuals can observe their own work patterns, actively listen to feedback, and analyze the reasons behind their successes and failures. This process of objective self-assessment, when aligned with clear organizational performance and career systems, provides a powerful foundation for growth (Haerofiatna et al., 2021).

A crucial organizational factor in this process is the cultivation of a positive and supportive culture. A strong organizational culture that encourages personal development can significantly shape an individual's attitudes and behaviors, making it easier for them to internalize and live out the organization's core values. Research consistently demonstrates that a healthy culture not only drives overall organizational success but also directly supports individual innovation and high performance (Koc & Ceylan, 2007; Zeb et al., 2021).

To systematically improve individual performance, organizations must focus on three core pillars: Employee Motivation, Employee Ability, and Role Clarity. These three elements are deeply interconnected and form the foundation upon which high performance is built. By strategically addressing each area, organizations can create an environment where individuals are empowered to thrive, grow, and make a meaningful impact.

2.2.2.1 Employee Motivation

Motivation is the psychological engine that drives performance. As Ahmadvand asserts, for individuals to pursue and achieve meaningful goals, they must be adequately motivated, feel a sense of contentment in their roles, and have a clear sense of purpose (cited in Farhad Zare, 2012). Without these psychological and emotional anchors, employees may struggle to fully engage with their responsibilities. This is supported by empirical research from Ganta (2014), who found a strong, direct relationship between an employee's level of motivation and

their productivity. Motivated employees are not only more efficient but also demonstrate greater initiative, resilience, and long-term commitment to organizational success. Motivation can be nurtured through both intrinsic factors, such as recognition, autonomy, and personal growth opportunities, and extrinsic rewards, like bonuses and promotions (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

2.2.2.2 Employee Ability

Ability, or competency, refers to the "physical or mental strength or skill required to do something," as defined by the Cambridge Dictionary. This encompasses two main categories of skills:

Technical Skills: These are the specific, often tangible aptitudes and knowledge required for a particular position, such as proficiency in programming languages, operating machinery, or financial analysis (Snyder et al., 2006). These are often referred to as "what you know" (Hunt, 2007).

Soft Skills: These are the interpersonal and behavioral skills like communication, teamwork, problem-solving, and adaptability, which are crucial for effective collaboration and navigating workplace dynamics.

In an organizational context, competencies represent the collective assets that employees contribute, including their knowledge, experience, and attitudes (Mackay, 2017). Developing these competencies is essential for achieving strategic objectives, aligning employee behaviors with contemporary standards, and fostering innovative forms of collaboration (Cadin L., 2007). Continuous learning and targeted training opportunities are therefore critical investments for enhancing employee ability (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006).

2.2.2.3 Employee Role Clarity

Having clear employee roles and well-defined expectations is a key driver of high-level engagement and performance. The concept of role clarity has been a subject of study since the mid-20th century (Tangavelu & Sudhahar, 2017). When individuals have a precise understanding of what is expected of them, how their work will be evaluated, and how their contributions fit into the larger organizational picture, they feel more confident, secure, and productive.

Conversely, role ambiguity (a lack of clarity regarding job responsibilities and expectations) is a significant source of workplace stress and anxiety, which can severely reduce productivity. Defining role expectations is therefore a critical first step in the hiring and onboarding process. Research has shown that role clarity positively influences job satisfaction, which in turn has a positive impact on an individual's performance in fulfilling their responsibilities (Diala et al., 2011). In a study by Hettiarachchi and Das (2014), job responsibilities were used as a measure of job satisfaction, and a significant positive relationship was found between role clarity, satisfaction, and overall performance.

2.3. SERVANT LEADERSHIP, TOXIC LEADERSHIP, AND THEIR IMPACT ON INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE

According to Agarwal (2020), leadership styles have a significant impact on individual performance within organizations. Based on research by Wen et al. (2019), transformational leadership, which emphasizes inspiration, motivation, and personal development, consistently shows a strong positive effect on individual and team performance, enhancing both task and contextual outcomes. According to Iqbal (2015), democratic and participative leadership styles also foster higher individual performance by encouraging involvement, open communication, and shared decision-

making, which boost motivation and job satisfaction. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership, characterized by a hands-off approach, tends to negatively affect individual performance due to lack of guidance and support (Baig, 2019). As indicated by Wen et al. (2019), transactional leadership, which relies on rewards and penalties, can improve performance in structured environments but is generally less effective for long-term engagement unless combined with positive psychological factors. According to Biloa (2023), authoritarian or autocratic leadership may yield short-term gains but often leads to lower morale and diminished performance over time, especially if not adapted to the specific context. As mentioned by Meslec (2020), charismatic leadership can enhance individual performance, particularly when leaders articulate a compelling vision, but its effects may depend on cultural and situational fit. Overall, leadership styles that prioritize empowerment, support, and ethical behavior are most effective in driving sustained individual performance (Baig, 2019).

Leadership plays a crucial role in how well individuals perform within an organization. The way leaders interact with their teams can either motivate them to reach their highest potential or, on the contrary, lead to disengagement and reduced performance. Two distinct leadership styles that significantly influence individual performance are servant leadership and toxic leadership. While servant leadership focuses on fostering trust, growth, and empowerment, toxic leadership tends to create environments rooted in fear and insecurity. This section explores how both leadership styles impact individual performance, backed by existing research.

Servant leadership is centered on the idea of serving others. Leaders who adopt this approach prioritize the well-being of their teams, creating an environment where employees feel valued, supported, and empowered to excel (Duursema, 2013). Servant leaders actively work to meet the needs of their team, guiding them toward personal and professional growth. This style encourages employees to take ownership of their work, boosting their motivation and commitment (Duursema, 2013). When employees trust their leaders, feel cared for, and are given room to grow, they are more likely to perform at their best (Ireland & Hitt, 1999).

One key strength of servant leadership is the trust it fosters between leaders and their teams. This trust helps build a positive and secure environment where employees feel confident in their abilities and are more willing to take initiative. When individuals believe in their leaders' support and care for their growth, their job satisfaction and performance improve significantly (Duursema, 2013). Additionally, servant leadership emphasizes continuous learning and development. Servant leaders provide resources, guidance, and opportunities that enable employees to enhance their skills. This not only boosts individual performance but also helps build a culture of empowerment where employees are motivated to perform at a higher level. The encouragement of autonomy, creativity, and risk-taking within servant leadership fosters an environment of innovation, where individuals feel empowered to think outside the box and contribute to problem-solving (Boal & Schultz, 2007; Dimitrios et al., 2013).

In stark contrast, toxic leadership can severely undermine individual performance. Leaders who engage in toxic behaviors create a hostile work environment characterized by fear, insecurity, and lack of trust. Toxic leaders may micromanage, show favoritism, or manipulate employees, leading to low morale and disengagement (Boal & Schultz, 2007). Employees working under toxic leadership are more likely to feel unappreciated, unsupported, and demotivated, resulting in a decline in both their performance and their overall satisfaction with their work.

Toxic leadership creates a culture of stress and dissatisfaction. Employees under toxic leaders often experience burnout and emotional exhaustion, leading to decreased enthusiasm for their tasks (Breene & Nunes, 2006). The lack of support and recognition from toxic leaders prevents employees from feeling motivated to perform at their best, which can significantly impact their productivity and morale. Moreover, toxic leadership stifles creativity and innovation. Employees in such environments may feel fearful of offering new ideas or taking risks, as they might be criticized or punished. Without psychological safety, individuals are less likely to take initiative or engage in problem-solving, which limits their ability to perform creatively and innovatively (Dimitrios et al., 2013). In a toxic work culture, employees focus more

on simply surviving their daily tasks rather than excelling in their roles. Toxic leadership also hampers teamwork and collaboration. Toxic leaders often create division within teams, promoting unhealthy competition and fostering a sense of isolation. This lack of cooperation not only affects interpersonal relationships but also harms the collective performance of teams (Gardner et al., 2010). High-performing teams rely on collaboration, trust, and mutual support to succeed, and when these elements are missing, individual performance suffers.

The differences between servant and toxic leadership emphasize the profound effect leadership styles have on individual performance. Servant leadership, with its focus on care, empowerment, and trust, creates a positive, motivating environment where employees feel supported and are encouraged to perform at their best (Duursema, 2013). When leaders invest in the growth and development of their teams, it fosters a strong sense of ownership and higher levels of job satisfaction, leading to improved performance (Duursema, 2013). Conversely, toxic leadership creates a negative and fear-driven environment that undermines individual performance. Employees under toxic leaders often feel unsupported and disengaged, which results in poor performance outcomes. The lack of trust, coupled with the stifling of creativity and autonomy, makes it difficult for employees to reach their full potential (Boal & Schultz, 2007). Research by Dimitrios et al. (2013) also shows that toxic leadership leads to higher turnover rates and burnout, further diminishing individual performance.

Trust and empowerment are central to both servant and toxic leadership, but they work in fundamentally different ways. Servant leadership fosters trust by prioritizing employees' well-being and development. When employees feel that their leaders genuinely care about their success and personal growth, they are more motivated to engage in their roles and give their best effort (Ireland & Hitt, 1999). Servant leaders actively involve their teams in decision-making processes, grant them autonomy, and provide necessary support, all of which contribute to improved individual performance (Duursema, 2013). In contrast, toxic leadership erodes trust by creating an atmosphere of fear, manipulation, and disempowerment. Employees under toxic

leadership often feel disconnected from their leaders and colleagues, leading to low motivation and decreased performance (Boal & Schultz, 2007). Without the psychological safety to take risks and innovate, individual performance suffers, and employees are left feeling disempowered and disengaged (Gardner et al., 2010).

Finally, the leadership style adopted by an organization has a profound impact on individual performance. Servant leadership, with its emphasis on trust, empowerment, and personal development, creates an environment where employees are motivated, engaged, and able to perform at their highest potential (Dursema, 2013). On the other hand, toxic leadership fosters a negative, fear-driven environment that hinders performance and leads to disengagement (Boal & Schultz, 2007). Organizations must recognize the significance of leadership styles in shaping the experiences of their employees. Leadership has the power to either unlock the full potential of individuals or limit their ability to perform. Research highlights that servant leadership not only enhances individual performance but also contributes to the well-being and satisfaction of employees, whereas toxic leadership leads to disengagement and decreased performance.

According to Kaltiainen (2020), servant leadership and toxic leadership have markedly different effects on individual performance. Servant leadership, which centers on supporting and empowering employees, has been shown to enhance individual task performance, adaptive performance, creativity, and work engagement, largely by increasing trust, reducing burnout, and fostering a positive ethical climate. From the point of view of Saleem (2020), studies consistently find that servant leaders build affective trust with their followers, which directly mediates improvements in individual performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. Based on research by Sianturi (2024), this leadership style also encourages innovation and self-efficacy, further boosting both individual and team outcomes. In contrast, toxic leadership typically undermines individual performance by eroding trust, increasing stress, and creating negative work environments, which can lead to disengagement and burnout (Kaltiainen, 2020). While the current research focus is on the positive impacts of servant leadership, the absence of servant leadership qualities

or the presence of toxic behaviors is likely to have the opposite effect, diminishing individual well-being and performance. Overall, fostering servant leadership practices is strongly associated with higher individual performance, while toxic leadership is detrimental to both employee outcomes and organizational success (Zhang, 2019; Saleem, 2020).



CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH

3.1 PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

Of course, there are many different objectives in this study, but the most important objectives of this study are as follows:

1. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between individual performance, toxic leadership, and servant leadership. The findings showed that individual performance and servant leadership were positively correlated, while performance and toxic leadership were negatively correlated. Furthermore, there was a significant inverse relationship between toxic and servant leadership, suggesting that these approaches are diametrically opposed and have distinct effects on workers.

2. The study also examined individual performance across gender, age, and work experience, as well as the degrees of toxic and servant leadership styles. The majority of the differences were not statistically significant, although there were some minor variations. The significance of servant leadership in fostering employee effectiveness and well-being was highlighted by regression analyses that also revealed both leadership philosophies significantly predicted individual performance.

- 3.

3.2 THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

Understanding how different leadership styles influence individual performance is key to building successful and sustainable businesses. Leadership plays a major role in shaping employee motivation, behavior, and productivity and these factors directly impact both professional success and personal development. Good leadership not only creates a positive work environment but also supports strong decision-making, personal accountability, and overall efficiency.

This study explores how various leadership approaches such as transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire affect employee engagement, creativity, and personal growth. By looking at how these styles work in practice, businesses can design leadership strategies that help employees perform better and feel more empowered in their roles.

The research is especially relevant to businesses in Northern Iraq, where economic and market conditions are changing rapidly. Companies in the region face unique challenges, including shifting job expectations, difficulties in retaining talent, and skill gaps. By gaining deeper insights into how leadership styles influence individual outcomes, organizations can adopt more effective management practices that build employee resilience and support personal development.

In addition to offering practical advice for local businesses, this study also contributes to broader academic and professional conversations about leadership. While there's been a lot of global research on leadership, there's still limited data on how it impacts individual performance in the Middle East particularly in Northern Iraq. This study aims to help fill that gap by providing fresh insights into leadership in a region undergoing cultural and economic transformation.

Ultimately, the findings of this research can benefit policymakers, HR professionals, and business leaders. The results can inform leadership training programs, employee evaluation systems, and workplace policies designed to boost individual performance. By identifying leadership styles that truly support employee growth and satisfaction, businesses can improve productivity and help their teams build long-term, meaningful careers. The goal is to promote leadership that not only drives business success but also unlocks the personal potential of individuals supporting broader economic growth in Northern Iraq.

3.3 THE HYPOTHESIS OF RESEARCH

H01: There is a correlation between Toxic Leadership, servant leadership and individual performance.

H02: There is a significant effect of leadership different styles on individual performance.

H03: There is a significant effect of servant leadership on individual performance.

H04: There is a significant difference in the level of Toxic Leadership according to gender.

H05: There is a significant difference in the level of servant leadership behavior according to gender.

H06: There is a significant difference in the level of individual Performance according to gender.

3.4 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN STRUCTURE

Since data collection gives researchers the information they need to analyze and draw conclusions, it is an essential part of the practical side of research. A structured (closed-ended) questionnaire was used in this study to guarantee consistency and reliability in responses, though other tools can be used for this purpose as well. At first, there were three primary sections to the questionnaire. Key variables like age, gender, work experience, job position, and educational background were among the demographic data gathered in the first section. Scale of Leadership Styles: This 18-item scale, which is broken down into two main dimensions toxic leadership and servant leadership behavior is intended to evaluate leadership behaviors.

Toxic Leadership – 12 items make up this dimension, which assesses actions linked to negative leadership practices like favoritism, manipulation, a lack of accountability, and fostering a hostile work environment. The Kusy & Holloway (2009) questionnaire served as the basis for the toxic leadership scale used in this investigation.

Servant Leadership Behavior: The questionnaire created by Sendjaya et al. (2019) served as the basis for the Servant Leadership Behavior scale used in this investigation. Six items measuring positive leadership traits are included in this dimension. A 7-point Likert scale is used

to rate each item in the questionnaire, giving respondents a variety of ways to indicate how much they agree with each item. "Strongly agree," "Agree," "Partially agree," "Neutral," "Partially disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly disagree" are the possible answers. A thorough assessment of leadership styles is made possible by this methodical approach, which provides information on both harmful and beneficial leadership practices inside a company. Organizations can use the findings to pinpoint leadership issues and put improvement plans into action.

Individual Performance Scale

A validated measurement tool created by Koopmans et al. (2014) was used to evaluate individual performance. Each of the five main components of this tool is intended to capture a distinct aspect of a worker's performance at work. A seven-point Likert scale (7 options) was used to ask respondents to rate how much they agreed with each statement. The response options were "Strongly agree," "Agree," "Partly agree," "Neutral," "Partly disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly disagree." This scale helps guarantee thorough data collection for analysis and enables a nuanced understanding of how employees perceive their work performance.

3.5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research is a systematic effort aimed at discovering, developing, and validating knowledge. It is an intellectual process that has evolved over centuries, constantly adapting in purpose and methodology while striving to uncover the truth. Additionally, research is an honest, thorough, and thoughtful pursuit of facts, along with their meanings and implications, in relation to a specific problem. The outcomes or findings of any research should serve as a credible, verifiable, and meaningful contribution to the body of knowledge in the respective field of study (Pandey and Pandey, 2015, P.8). But Research methodology refers to the systematic approach, techniques, and procedures used to conduct research. It encompasses the principles, strategies, and tools that guide researchers in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data to ensure the validity and reliability of their findings (Kothari, 2004, P.8).

The researcher used a quantitative approach in this study, analyzing the data with descriptive statistics. The northern Iraqi province of Sulaimani served as the study's site. Accuracy and dependability in measuring the variables under investigation were ensured by the methodical

data collection process. Numerical data could be summarized and interpreted through the use of descriptive statistics, which also offered insights into relationships, patterns, and trends pertinent to the study's goals.

3.6 RESEARCH POPULATION

A study population refers to an entire group of individuals, objects, or units that share common characteristics and the researcher draws conclusions or generalizes the results. This population is the focus of the study, and the findings should be applied to this large group. Population is clearly very important as it determines and ensures that the limits of the study are representative of the samples used in the study. Researchers need to identify relevant characteristics of population, such as age, gender, work, and location, to accurately interpret the data and apply results to a wider group (Creswell, 2014, p. 119).

Residents of northern Iraq's Sulaimani province who work for both governmental and non-governmental organizations make up the study's population. The study specifically targets people who work for a variety of businesses and organizations in the area. The research community has been defined as 150 businesses and organizations in total. These companies provide a diverse sample of workers for the study because they represent a range of sectors and industries. By concentrating on this group, the study hopes to obtain a comprehensive grasp of the working conditions, attitudes, and behaviors of people in various organizational contexts within Sulaimani. The sample will aid in guaranteeing that the results are pertinent and useful to the province's workforce as a whole.

3.7 SAMPLE OF THE RESEARCH

A study sample refers to a subgroup of individuals, objects, or events selected from a larger population for research purposes. Because total population studies are often unrealistic due to time, cost and accessibility limitations, researchers use representative samples to draw conclusions that can be generalized to the entire population (Kothari, 2004, p. 55). To ensure

fairness and remove selection bias, 400 participants were chosen at random to make up the study's sample. By giving every member of the population an equal chance of being selected, this technique improves the sample's representativeness. As shown in Table 1, in sample size, 236 of the 400 participants were men and 164 were women.

Table 3.1: Sample of Research

Variable	N	Percentage
Gender		
Male	236	59%
Female	164	41%
Age		
18-25 year	97	24.5%
26-35 year	237	59.5%
36 and above year	64	16%
Academic Qualification		
Diploma	89	32.3%
Bachelor	240	60%
Professional	23	5.8%
Graduate	48	12%
Professional experiences		
5 and below years	129	32.2%
6-1 year	186	46.5%
11-15 year	46	11.5%
Above 16 year	39	9.8%
Job passion		
Managers	58	14.5%
Supervisors	47	11.7%
Trainer	77	19.3%
Employee	218	54.5%
Total	400	100%

The 400 participants in the research sample are shown in Table 1 along with their professional and demographic details. In terms of gender, there were slightly more men in the study than women, with 236 (59%) being men and 164 (41%) being women. The age distribution of the sample indicates that it is primarily made up of young to middle-aged adults, with the majority of respondents (59.5%) being between the ages of 26 and 35, 24.5% being between the ages of 18 and 25, and 16% being over the age of 36. The majority of participants (60%), according to academic qualifications, had a bachelor's degree. Diploma holders (32.3%), graduates (12%), and people with professional qualifications (5.8%) came next. This suggests that the sample is comparatively well-educated, with a higher proportion of undergraduates.

Data on job position and professional experience provide more information about the sample. According to the respondents' professional experience distribution, most of them fall into the 6–10 years category (46.5%), indicating a workforce with a moderate amount of experience and probably familiarity with organizational procedures. 5 years and below (32.2%) comes next, showing a sizable percentage of relatively new hires who might contribute new ideas but have less organizational experience. The more seasoned employees who contribute long-term expertise and institutional knowledge are represented by the smaller segments of 11–15 years of experience (11.5%) and above 16 years of experience (9.8%). The majority of respondents (54.5%) were employees, followed by managers (14.5%), supervisors (11.7%), and trainers (19.3%). The sample offers a thorough foundation for examining opinions of leadership and individual performance within the organization under study because it generally represents a diverse workforce in terms of age, education, experience, and job position.

3.8. RESEARCH PROCEDURE

As was already mentioned, the main method used in this study to collect data was questionnaires. Due to their low cost, time efficiency, and capacity to collect standardized responses from a large number of participants, questionnaires are widely acknowledged as an efficient and useful research method. The questionnaire's straightforward format was chosen to guarantee

accessibility and comprehension, enabling participants from a variety of backgrounds to understand and provide accurate answers.

The researcher visited the study participants in person after completing the questionnaire. During these visits, which were conducted in the province of Sulaimani, the researcher spoke with staff members, managers, supervisors, and employees from a range of public and private organizations. The researcher assured participants that their answers would only be used for academic and scientific purposes during these exchanges, outlining the goals of the study in detail and stressing the confidentiality of the information gathered. Participants were urged to participate willingly, and after giving their permission, they filled out the questionnaire, adding insightful information to the study.

3.9 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Like any scientific study, this research encountered various obstacles and limitations that affected the research process. The most significant challenges are outlined below:

1. Time Restraints: The researcher had to finish the study in a limited amount of time while juggling other academic obligations. This time constraint made it more difficult to investigate more sources and perform a more thorough literature review. The study could have been further enhanced with more data and in-depth analysis if more time had been available.
2. Difficulties with Data Collection: It was difficult to collect a lot of data in a short amount of time. Due to the researcher's visits to numerous institutions, businesses, and organizations, travel and logistical expenses went up. The sampling procedure was further complicated by the reluctance of certain employees to participate because of their hectic work schedules.
3. Limited Access to Participants: Although an attempt was made to include a wide range of respondents, it was difficult to get in touch with some businesses and organizations. The number of available respondents was constrained by the stringent policies of certain organizations regarding research participation.

4. Financial Restrictions: The researcher was further burdened by the need to pay for field visits, questionnaire printing, and travel to various locations. More funding would have made it possible to collect more data, which might have resulted in a more thorough investigation.

3.10 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

3.10.1 Cronbach's Alpha based on Reliability Statistics

From the very beginning of the questionnaire design process, the researcher ensured the reliability and stability of the scale to confirm its compatibility with the research population. This was done to guarantee that the scale accurately reflects the characteristics and perspectives of the participants. The reliability analysis results, as presented in Table 2, demonstrate the consistency of the scale, ensuring its effectiveness in measuring the intended variables.

Table 3.2: The Value of Cronbach's Alpha Based on Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics		
Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Toxic Leadership	0.935	12
Servant Leadership Behavior	0.851	6
Individual Performance Scale	0.833	5

According to the Cronbach's Alpha values for each measured variable, the reliability analysis shown in Table 2 shows strong internal consistency. The Cronbach's Alpha for Toxic Leadership was 0.935 for all 12 items, indicating high reliability and high consistency in capturing the same underlying dimension across the items used to measure this construct. The scale's high alpha value suggests that it accurately captures participants' opinions of toxic leadership practices in the context under study. Comparably, the Servant Leadership Behavior scale's six items had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.851, indicating a high degree of reliability. This implies that the servant leadership items are appropriate for use in additional research and consistently measure the construct.

With a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.833 for all five items, the Individual Performance Scale demonstrated strong reliability. This outcome demonstrates that the individual performance scale's items accurately measure various facets of worker performance as intended. All three variables collectively surpass the widely recognized Cronbach's Alpha cutoff point of 0.70, indicating the statistical reliability of the study's measurement tools. These findings lend credibility to the information gathered and validate the results of further analyses that will look into the connections between servant leadership, toxic leadership, and individual performance.

3.10.2. Cronbach's Alpha based on Scale Statistics

Based on scale statistics, Table 5 displays the Cronbach's Alpha values, which show the internal consistency and dependability of the measurement instruments employed in this investigation. In general, a Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.70 is regarded as acceptable; values above 0.80 indicate good reliability, and values above 0.90 indicate excellent consistency. The values reported in Table 3 attest to the scales' adequate reliability in this study, guaranteeing that the data gathered is stable, consistent, and appropriate for additional statistical analysis. These outcomes support the validity of the measurement instruments used and lend credence to the study's conclusions.

Table 3.3: The Value of Cronbach's Alpha Based on Scale Statistics

Variable	Scale Statistics				
	Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Toxic Leadership	3.66	0.288	1.42	0.935	12
Servant Leadership Behavior	4.92	0.058	1.17	0.851	6
Individual Performance Scale	5.17	0.025	1.04	0.833	5

All three of the study's measurement scales exhibit strong internal consistency, according to the reliability analysis in Table 3, with Cronbach's Alpha values significantly above the acceptable cutoff of 0.70. With a reliability coefficient of 0.935, the 12-item Toxic Leadership scale

demonstrated the best consistency among its items and the least amount of measurement error when evaluating this construct. The six-item Servant Leadership Behavior scale had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.851, indicating high reliability and coherence in assessing servant leadership traits.

Likewise, the five-item Individual Performance Scale had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.833, indicating that it is a reliable instrument for assessing worker performance. Whereas the lower mean for toxic leadership (3.66) suggests that such behaviors are not as frequently reported, the relatively high mean values for individual performance (5.17) and servant leadership behavior (4.92) indicate that respondents generally have positive perceptions of these behaviors. Overall, the high Cronbach's Alpha values attest to the validity and consistency of the instruments employed, which makes them suitable for additional statistical analysis and hypothesis testing in the research

3.10.3. Tests of Normality

Two statistical metrics that characterize a distribution's shape are skewness and kurtosis. The degree of asymmetry in a data set's distribution is indicated by its skewness; a distribution with a long tail on the left (negative skew) or right (positive skew) indicates that the data are not symmetrically distributed around the mean. Conversely, kurtosis quantifies the distribution's "tailedness" or peakedness; a distribution with a higher kurtosis (leptokurtic) has heavy tails and a sharp peak, whereas one with a lower kurtosis (platykurtic) has light tails and a flatter peak. For many statistical analyses, these metrics are critical for determining normality and comprehending the underlying patterns in the data (West, Finch, & Curran, 1995)..

Various criteria for skewness and kurtosis have been suggested in the literature to determine whether data obtained from a sample exhibit a normal distribution. These criteria indicate that for data to be normally distributed, skewness and kurtosis values should be within the ± 1 range (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014), ± 1.5 range (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), or ± 2 range (George & Mallery, 2010). The results obtained from this perspective indicate that while some items and variables of the data meet the normal distribution assumption, others do not.

Furthermore, Kline (2011) stated that for data to be normally distributed, skewness values should be within the ± 3 range and kurtosis values should be within the ± 10 range. As shown in table 4.

Table 3.4: Skewness and Kurtosis of Variables

Variables	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
TL	0.146	0.122	-1.225	0.243
SLB	-1.536	0.122	3.236	0.243
IP	-1.536	0.122	3.236	0.243

The skewness values indicate how symmetrical the distribution of each variable is. A value close to zero suggests a normal or symmetrical distribution. The variable TL has a skewness of 0.146, which is slightly positive but very close to zero, indicating a nearly symmetrical distribution. In contrast, both SLB and IP show a skewness of -1.536, which means their distributions are significantly skewed to the left. This suggests that for SLB and IP, there are more values concentrated on the higher end, with a longer tail on the lower end.

Looking at kurtosis, we can understand the shape of the distribution in terms of the heaviness of the tails. The TL variable has a kurtosis of -1.225, which suggests a platykurtic distribution—flatter than a normal curve with lighter tails, meaning fewer extreme values. On the other hand, both SLB and IP have kurtosis values of 3.236, indicating a leptokurtic distribution. This means that their data are more peaked with heavier tails than a normal distribution, suggesting a higher presence of outliers or extreme values.

The TL variable appears to follow a nearly normal distribution with a slight positive skew and flatter shape, making it less likely to have extreme values. In contrast, SLB and IP show strong negative skewness and high kurtosis, meaning they are asymmetrical and more prone to outliers. These characteristics should be taken into account before performing any statistical tests that assume normality, as the distributions of SLB and IP deviate significantly from the normal curve.

3.10.4. Factor Analyzes

3.10.4.1. Factor Analysis for Toxic Leadership (TL)

The factor analysis showed strong evidence for a unidimensional structure. The KMO value was 0.922, indicating excellent sampling adequacy, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was highly significant ($p < .001$), confirming suitability for factor extraction. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) revealed one dominant factor with an eigenvalue of 7.076, explaining 58.97% of the total variance, while all other components had eigenvalues below 1.0. This suggests that the items measure a single underlying construct effectively (Costello & Osborne, 2005, p. 3). Results of factor Analysis shown in table 5.

Table 3.5: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,922
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3372,393
	Df	66
	Sig.	,000

The results of the KMO and Bartlett's Test confirm that the dataset is highly suitable for factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value of 0.922 indicates excellent sampling adequacy, suggesting that the variables share enough common variance for reliable factor extraction. Additionally, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is highly significant ($\chi^2 = 3372.393$, $df = 66$, $p = .000$), confirming that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix and that meaningful relationships exist among the variables. Together, these findings strongly support the appropriateness of proceeding with factor analysis to explore the underlying factor structure of the measured constructs.

Table 3.6: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7,076	58,969	58,969	7,076	58,969	58,969
2	,954	7,950	66,919			
3	,742	6,181	73,100			
4	,603	5,025	78,125			
5	,584	4,864	82,989			
6	,494	4,117	87,106			
7	,375	3,126	90,231			
8	,307	2,557	92,788			
9	,291	2,421	95,209			
10	,227	1,895	97,104			
11	,207	1,727	98,831			
12	,140	1,169	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The Total Variance Explained table from the Principal Component Analysis reveals that only the first component has a substantial eigenvalue of 7.076, accounting for 58.97% of the total variance. This indicates that a significant portion of the variance in the data is explained by a single dominant factor. According to Kaiser's criterion (retaining components with eigenvalues greater than 1), only this first component should be retained, as it captures the core structure of the dataset. The steep drop from the first to the second eigenvalue (from 7.076 to 0.954) supports a unidimensional structure, suggesting that the items are highly interrelated and may measure a single underlying construct—such as overall leadership perception or a unified dimension of leadership behavior.

Table 3.7: Component Matrix^a for Toxic Leadership (TL)

Component Matrix ^a for Toxic Leadership (TL)	
	Component 1
TL1	,804
TL2	,843
TL3	,795
TL4	,828
TL5	,747
TL6	,812
TL7	,783
TL8	,785
TL9	,343
TL10	,779
TL11	,816
TL12	,752
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.	
a. 1 components extracted.	

The majority of items loaded strongly onto a single factor, according to the Component Matrix for Toxic Leadership (TL), suggesting a logical underlying construct. In particular, eleven of the twelve items showed high factor loadings above 0.74, with TL2 having the highest loading at 0.843 and TL5 has the lowest among the strong loadings at 0.747. This implies that the same latent dimension of toxic leadership is consistently measured by these items. TL9, on the other hand, has a significantly lower loading of 0.343, which might suggest that it is not in good alignment with the other items and should be reexamined or changed. The unidimensionality and internal consistency of the toxic leadership construct as measured by this instrument are generally supported by the high loadings.

3.10.4.2. Factor Analysis for Servant Leadership Behavior (SLB)

Table 3.8: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,842
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1011,989
	Df	15
	Sig.	,000

The data is appropriate for factor analysis, according to Table 8's findings. Kaiser's scale classifies the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy as "meritorious" at 0.842, indicating that the correlations between items are sufficiently compact to yield trustworthy factors. Furthermore, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is highly significant ($\chi^2 = 1011.989$, $df = 15$, $p < .001$), suggesting that the variables have significant relationships with one another and that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix. All of these findings lend credence to the idea that factor analysis can be used to investigate the data's underlying structure.

Table 3.9: Total Variance Explained

Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,485	58,091	58,091	3,485	58,091	58,091
2	,759	12,642	70,733			
3	,686	11,428	82,161			
4	,414	6,902	89,063			
5	,392	6,536	95,599			
6	,264	4,401	100,000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						

According to the Principal Component Analysis results shown in Table 9, only one component—with an eigenvalue of 3.485, which accounts for 58.09% of the total variance—has an eigenvalue larger than 1.0. This implies that the data structure is based on a single dominant factor that explains most of the shared variance between the items. The second and third components only account for 12.64% and 11.43% of the variance, respectively, and the other components have eigenvalues significantly below 1.0. Kaiser's criterion states that only the first component should be kept since it shows a unidimensional structure and lends credence to the idea that the items are accurately measuring a single underlying construct.

Table 3.10: Component Matrix^a for Servant Leadership Behavior (SLB)

Component Matrix ^a for Servant Leadership Behavior (SLB)	
	Component
	1
SLB1	,577
SLB2	,812
SLB3	,751
SLB4	,805
SLB5	,828
SLB6	,771
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.	
a. 1 components extracted.	

All six items loaded positively onto a single factor, indicating a unidimensional structure, according to the Servant Leadership Behavior (SLB) Component Matrix. The items are moderately to strongly associated with the underlying construct of servant leadership, according to the factor loadings, which range from 0.577 (SLB1) to 0.828 (SLB5). While SLB5 and SLB4 have the strongest correlations with the latent factor, SLB1 has the weakest loading, albeit it is still within an acceptable range. This pattern confirms that the items on the SLB scale collectively reflect the fundamental qualities of servant leadership and supports the scale's construct validity and internal consistency.

3.10.4.3. Factor Analysis for Individual Performance (IP)

Table 3.11: KMO and Bartlett's Test

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,818
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	840,205
	Df	10
	Sig.	,000

The KMO and Bartlett's Test results show that factor analysis is a good fit for the data. With a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of 0.818, the variables have sufficient common variance

to support factor extraction and good sampling adequacy. Additionally, the results of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity are highly significant ($\chi^2 = 840.205$, $df = 10$, $p < .001$), indicating that there are adequate correlations between the variables and that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix. All of these findings point to the suitability of using factor analysis to find underlying dimensions in the data.

Table 3.12: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,051	61,030	61,030	3,051	61,030	61,030
2	,791	15,828	76,858			
3	,527	10,550	87,407			
4	,384	7,681	95,088			
5	,246	4,912	100,000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The total variance explained by the components identified by Principal Component Analysis is shown in Table 12. The first component explains the majority of the variance in the data, as evidenced by its eigenvalue of 3.051, which accounts for 61.03% of the total variance. With an eigenvalue of 0.791, the second component adds 15.83% to the total variance explained by the first two components, making it 76.86%. The third, fourth, and fifth components, which together account for 10.55%, 7.68%, and 4.91% of the variance, respectively, explain progressively less of the variance than the previous components. This demonstrates how the first two components essentially capture the data structure.

Table 3.13: Component Matrix^a for Individual Performance (IP)

Component Matrix ^a for Individual Performance (IP)	
	Component
	1
IP1	,850
IP2	,873
IP3	,815
IP4	,752
IP5	,581
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.	
a. 1 components extracted.	

All five items load onto a single underlying factor, according to the Component Matrix for Individual Performance (IP), suggesting a unidimensional construct. Strong correlations between the items and the latent variable of individual performance are indicated by factor loadings, which range from 0.581 (IP5) to 0.873 (IP2). While IP5 has the lowest loading, it is still acceptable. In contrast, IP2 and IP1 show the highest loadings, indicating that they are the most representative of the construct. All things considered, this loading pattern supports the validity of the instrument being used and validates that the scale items accurately measure the concept of individual performance.

3.10.5. Correlation between Leadership Style (Servant Leadership Behavior and Toxic Leadership) and individual Performance

To analyze the correlation between leadership styles (servant leadership behavior and toxic leadership) and individual performance, Pearson's correlation coefficient is an appropriate statistical tool. This method measures the strength and direction of the linear relationship between continuous variables, allowing researchers to determine the degree to which servant and toxic leadership behaviors relate to employee performance (Field, 2018, p. 196). Calculating these correlations helps identify whether positive or negative leadership styles significantly influence individual performance outcomes, thereby providing valuable insights into leadership effectiveness.

Table 3.14: Correlation Between Leadership Style (Servant Leadership Behavior and Toxic Leadership) and Individual Performance

		Toxic Leadership	Servant Leadership Behavior	Individual Performance	M	SD
Toxic Leadership	Pearson Correlation		0.509-**	0.191-**	3.6654	1.42
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000		
Servant Leadership Behavior	Pearson Correlation	0.509-**		.203**	4.92	1.17
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000		
individual Performance	Pearson Correlation	0.191-**	.203**		5.17	1.04
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

Hypothesis H01 is amply supported by the correlation analysis results shown in Table 14. Individual performance tends to decrease as toxic leadership rises, according to the results, which show a statistically significant positive correlation between the two ($r = 0.191$, $p < 0.01$). This lends credence to the idea that toxic leadership practices, like intimidation, manipulation, or self-interest, undermine worker motivation and output. On the other hand, there is a strong positive correlation between individual performance and servant leadership behavior ($r = 0.203$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that workers perform better under supportive, sympathetic, and service-oriented leadership. By demonstrating that there is a real connection between leadership style and performance outcomes, these correlations support the hypothesis.

The hypothesis is further supported by the data, which show a strong and significant negative correlation between toxic leadership and servant leadership behavior ($r = -0.509$, $p < 0.01$). This inverse relationship implies that these two leadership philosophies are inherently diametrically opposed and do not typically coexist in the same leadership setting. The mean scores for toxic leadership are 3.66 (SD = 1.42), servant leadership behavior is 4.92 (SD = 1.17), and individual performance is 5.17 (SD = 1.04), according to supporting descriptive statistics. When combined, these findings support H03 by showing that both toxic and servant leadership philosophies have a major impact on individual performance. They also emphasize how important it is to support servant leadership in order to create a more positive, productive workplace.

3.10.6. Predicated effect of leadership styles (servant leadership behavior and toxic leadership) and individual performance

To examine the predictive relationship between leadership styles (servant leadership behavior and toxic leadership) and individual performance, multiple linear regression analysis is an effective tool. This technique assesses how well servant and toxic leadership behaviors, as independent variables, predict variations in individual performance, the dependent variable. By estimating regression coefficients, the analysis identifies the unique contribution of each leadership style while controlling for the other, allowing researchers to understand the relative impact and significance of each leadership behavior on performance outcomes (Field, 2018, p.

317). This approach provides a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics between leadership styles and employee performance. As shown in table 15 and 16.

Table 3.15: Predicated Effect of Toxic Leadership on the Individual Performance

Toxic Leadership	R	Variance(R²)	Beta(β)	T-test	P value	F	Df
Individual performance.	0.191	0.037	-.191	40.254	0.000	15.130	399

The findings of a regression analysis looking at the predictive impact of toxic leadership on individual performance are shown in Table 15. The two variables have a weakly negative relationship, as indicated by the correlation coefficient (R), which is -0.191. Only 3.7% of the variation in individual performance can be explained by toxic leadership, according to the R² value of 0.037. This implies that although there is a negative weak correlation between toxic leadership and performance, other factors account for the majority of performance variance.

The regression results are statistically significant even though the relationship is weak. The t-test value is 40.254, the p-value is 0.000, and the standardized regression coefficient (Beta) is 0.191. Toxic leadership does have a real, albeit slight, impact on individual performance, according to this highly significant p-value. The F-value of 15.130 with 399 degrees of freedom indicates that the model is statistically significant overall. In conclusion, even though toxic leadership has a statistically significant effect on individual performance, its real-world impact seems to be limited. This highlights the significance of taking other factors into account when assessing performance outcomes. Its show that the hypothesis H02 was accepted because there is statistically significance between Toxic Leadership and individual performance.

Table 3.16: Predicated Effect of Servant Leadership Behavior on the Individual Performance

Servant Leadership Behavior	R	Variance(R²)	Beta(β)	T-test	P value	F	df
Individual performance.	0.203	0.041	0.203	19.506	0.000	17.183	399

The findings of a regression analysis assessing the anticipated impact of servant leadership behavior on individual performance are displayed in Table 16. With a correlation coefficient (R) of 0.203, servant leadership and performance appear to be positively correlated, albeit weakly.

About 4.1% of the variation in individual performance can be explained by servant leadership, according to the R² value of 0.041. Despite the small percentage, it suggests that servant leadership has a slightly stronger predictive influence and contributes more to performance outcomes than toxic leadership (as indicated in Table 18).

With a t-test value of 19.506 and a p-value of 0.000, the regression coefficient (Beta = 0.203) is statistically significant. This suggests that servant leadership has a significant and consistent impact on worker performance. The F-value of 17.183 with 399 degrees of freedom indicates that the entire model is statistically significant. As a result, the data supports the null hypothesis (H03), which holds that servant leadership significantly affects individual performance. Even though the effect size is modest, the statistical significance shows that servant leadership improves individual performance, indicating that it is a useful leadership style in an organizational setting.

3.10.7. Analysis of Leadership Styles and Individual Performance level

To ascertain whether the mean of a single sample deviates significantly from a known or predicted population mean, statisticians employ the one-sample t-test (Field, 2018, p. 246). Taking sample size and variability into consideration, this test compares the sample mean to the test value and yields a t-value and significance level (p-value) to determine whether the observed difference is likely the result of chance. When it comes to leadership styles and individual performance, the one-sample t-test can confirm whether the average scores for variables like servant leadership behavior, toxic leadership, and individual performance differ significantly from a neutral or benchmark value. This can provide the groundwork for additional analysis.

Table 3.17: Level of Leadership Style and Individual Performance

Variables	N	Mean(M)	SD	T-test	Sig- 2 tailed	Df
Toxic Leadership	400	3.66	1.42	51.42	0.000	399
Servant Leadership Behavior	400	4.92	1.17	83.70	0.000	399
individual Performance	400	5.17	1.04	99.415	0.000	399

Important information about the three variables under investigation is revealed by the descriptive statistics. The 400 participants' perceptions and experiences of toxic leadership varied significantly, as evidenced by the relatively high standard deviation of 1.42 and the mean score of 3.66 for toxic leadership. With a higher mean of 4.92 and a lower standard deviation of 1.17, servant leadership behaviors appear to be more common and consistently viewed throughout the sample. The group's performance levels may be comparatively stable and positive, as evidenced by the highest mean score of 5.17 for individual performance and the lowest variability ($SD = 1.04$).

The extremely high t-values (51.42 for Toxic Leadership, 83.70 for Servant Leadership Behavior, and 99.415 for Individual Performance) and p-values of 0.000 (less than 0.001) for each variable show highly significant differences from the test value (typically the midpoint or neutral point of the scale). These results imply that the means of all three variables differ from the neutral or expected values in a statistically significant way, demonstrating that participant responses are not random variation but rather represent significant perceptions or experiences. Robust test statistics are ensured by the degrees of freedom ($df = 399$), which are equivalent to the sample size less one. When combined, these descriptive and inferential findings show that participants generally rate individual performance highly and strongly support servant leadership behavior over toxic leadership. The notable variations imply that these performance levels and leadership philosophies are unique and quantifiable within this sample. This establishes the groundwork for additional regression and correlation studies to investigate the potential effects of leadership styles on individual performance outcomes.

3.10.8. Level Toxic Leadership According To Gender

A statistical technique for comparing the means of two independent groups to ascertain whether there is a statistically significant difference between them on a given variable is the independent samples t-test (Field, 2018, p. 374). It is appropriate when determining whether different groups—for example, managers versus subordinates or male versus female employees—have significantly different opinions about leadership styles or individual performance levels. In order

to ascertain statistical significance, this test calculates a t-value and a p-value by analyzing the variance and mean differences between groups.

Table 3.18: Level Toxic Leadership According to Gender

Gender	N	Mean(M)	SD	T-test	Sig- 2 tailed	df
Male	236	3.67	1.43	0.128	0.898	398
Female	164	3.65	1.40			

The findings of a statistical analysis looking at toxic leadership levels by gender are shown in Table 18. According to the descriptive statistics, the mean score for toxic leadership was slightly higher for male participants (N = 236) (M = 3.67, SD = 1.43) than for female participants (N = 164), who reported a mean score of 3.65 (SD = 1.40). The small, non-significant variation favoring higher scores among males indicates that both genders perceive toxic leadership at nearly equal levels. According to the independent samples t-test, the inferential statistics show a t-value of 0.128 with a significance level (Sig. 2-tailed) of 0.898. The result is not statistically significant because the p-value is significantly higher than the standard cutoff of 0.05. This suggests that male and female respondents' perceptions of toxic leadership are not significantly different. The results unequivocally show that gender has no discernible impact on toxic leadership scores in this sample, despite the degrees of freedom (df = 398) providing additional evidence of the test's robustness. According to results, the H04 is reject because there is not statistically significance level toxic leadership according to gender.

3.10.9. Level Servant Leadership Behavior according to gender

Table 3.19: level Servant Leadership Behavior According to Gender

Gender	N	Mean(M)	SD	T-test	Sig- 2 tailed	df
Male	236	4.96	1.10	0.729	0.466	398
Female	164	4.87	1.27			

The descriptive statistics for servant leadership behavior by gender are shown in table 19. While female participants (N = 164) reported a slightly lower mean score of 4.87 with a standard deviation of 1.27, male participants (N = 236) reported a mean score of 4.96 with a standard deviation of 1.10. These findings imply that respondents of both sexes perceive or demonstrate servant leadership behavior in a comparatively similar way, with men displaying a slightly higher

mean. Females have a slightly higher standard deviation, which suggests that their responses vary more widely. The independent samples t-test yields a two-tailed significance level (p-value) of 0.466 and a t-value of 0.729. The difference in servant leadership behavior between males and females is not statistically significant because the p-value is significantly higher than the conventional 0.05 threshold. This indicates that among study participants, gender does not seem to significantly affect how servant leadership behavior is viewed or applied. The conclusion that gender-related differences in servant leadership behavior are insignificant in this context is supported by the degrees of freedom ($df = 398$), which confirm an adequate sample size for trustworthy analysis. According to results, the H_0 is rejecting because there is not statistically significance level servant leadership behavior according to gender.

3.10.10. Level Of Individual Performance According To Gender

Table 3.20: Level of Individual Performance According to Gender

Gender	N	Mean(M)	SD	T-test	Sig- 2 tailed	Df
Male	236	5.09	1.05	-1.771	0.077	398
Female	164	5.28	1.01			

A t-test analysis of individual performance levels by gender is shown in table 20. Male participants had an mean individual performance score of 5.09 with a standard deviation of 1.05, while female participants had an mean score of 5.28 with a standard deviation of 1.01. According to these figures, female participants generally report marginally better individual performance than their male counterparts, although the differences are not very noticeable. With a p-value (Sig-2 tailed) of 0.077 and a t-test value of -1.771, the results are above the 0.05 significance level. This suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in the individual performance of the male and female participants. The lack of statistical significance implies that the difference may be the result of chance rather than a significant distinction, even though the results indicate a slight trend of higher performance among female participants. The results imply that individual performance levels within the sample are not significantly influenced by gender. This suggests that the contributions made by male and female participants to individual performance are comparable. According to results, the H_0 is rejecting because there is not statistically significance level individual Performance according to gender.

3.10.11. Level of Toxic Leadership according to age

Analysis of Variance, or ANOVA, is a statistical method for figuring out whether the means of three or more independent groups differ in ways that are statistically significant (Field, 2018, p. 442). ANOVA lowers the possibility of Type I error by enabling researchers to look at several group differences at once, unlike the t-test, which only compares two groups. ANOVA can be used to determine whether people from various departments, age groups, educational backgrounds, or job positions have different perceptions of toxic leadership, servant leadership behavior, or performance levels in studies involving leadership styles and individual performance. When at least one group mean deviates from the others, as indicated by a significant F-value in an ANOVA, additional post hoc testing is necessary to pinpoint the precise group differences.

Table 3.21: Level of Toxic Leadership According to Age ANOVA Results

Age	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
18-25 Year	98	3.75	1.33	0.323	0.724	Between Groups	1.317	3
26-35 Year	238	3.62	1.49			Within Groups	809.571	396
36 and Above	64	3.69	1.32			Total	810.888	399
Total	400	3.66	1.42					

According to Table 21's ANOVA results, the mean toxic leadership scores for the various age groups are comparatively comparable, with the mean for the 18–25 year old group being 3.75, the 26–35 year old group being 3.62, and the 36 year old and older group being 3.69. The responses from each age group show moderate variability, as indicated by the standard deviations, which range from 1.32 to 1.49. These differences are not statistically significant, as indicated by the F-value of 0.323 and the two-tailed significance level of 0.724. This indicates

that rather than reflecting actual differences between groups, the variances in toxic leadership perceptions across age groups are probably the result of random variation.

It is clear from the sum of squares values that the within-groups variation (809.571) is much larger than the between-groups variation (1.317). This implies that rather than between age groups, the majority of the variation in opinions about toxic leadership occurs within each age group. The null hypothesis is upheld since the significance value is significantly higher than the conventional cutoff point of 0.05, indicating that there is no discernible variation in the perception of toxic leadership by age. These results suggest that respondents' perceptions of toxic leadership in their workplaces are not significantly influenced by age as a demographic factor.

3.10.12. Level of Servant Leadership Behavior according to age

Table 3.22: Level of Servant Leadership Behavior According to Age ANOVA Results

Age	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
18-25 Year	98	4.72	1.20	2.19 1	0.113	Between Groups	6.042	3
26-35 Year	238	5.01	1.18			Within Groups	547.447	396
36 and Above	64	4.92	1.09			Total	553.489	399
Total	400	4.92	1.17					

According to the ANOVA results in Table 22, the mean scores for servant leadership behavior differ slightly by age group, with the mean score for the 18–25 year old group being 4.72, the highest score for the 26–35 year old group being 5.01, and the mean score for the 36 year old and older group being 4.92. Within each group, the standard deviations, which range from 1.09 to 1.20, show comparatively low to moderate response variability. These differences are not statistically significant at the traditional 0.05 level, according to the F-value of 2.191 and the two-tailed significance level of 0.113. Accordingly, even though the 26–35 age group perceives servant leadership behavior to be somewhat higher, the variation between groups may be the result of chance rather than real differences.

This interpretation is supported by the sum of squares values, which show that the majority of the variation in servant leadership perceptions occurs within age groups rather than between them. The between-groups sum of squares (6.042) is significantly smaller than the within-groups sum of squares (547.447). The null hypothesis is upheld because the p-value is greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant variation in the perceptions of servant leadership according to age. This finding implies that respondents' assessments of servant leadership behavior are not influenced by their age and that opinions of these leadership traits are generally similar across the sample's age groups.

3.10.13. Level of individual Performance according to age

Table 3.23: Level of Individual Performance According to Age ANOVA Results

Age	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
18-25 Year	98	5.21	0.83	0.560	0.572	Between Groups	1.214	3
26-35 Year	238	5.18	1.10			Within Groups	430.661	396
36 and Above	64	5.04	1.09			Total	431.875	399
Total	400	5.17	1.04					

The mean scores for individual performance are closely aligned across age groups, according to the ANOVA results in Table 23. The 18–25 year group scored 5.21, the 26–35 year group scored 5.18, and the 36 year and older group scored 5.04, which is slightly lower. Within each age group, the standard deviations, which vary from 0.83 to 1.10, show little to moderate variation in performance perceptions. These minor variations are not statistically significant, according to the F-value of 0.560 and the two-tailed significance level of 0.572. This implies that any observed differences in performance scores between age groups are probably the result of chance rather than age-related differences.

Since the within-groups variation (430.661) is greater than the between-groups variation (1.214), the sum of squares values offer additional support. This demonstrates that rather than between age groups, most of the variation in performance perceptions occurs within each age group. The null hypothesis is upheld since the p-value is significantly higher than the 0.05 cutoff, indicating that age has no discernible effect on the performance levels of any individual in this sample. According to these findings, respondents of all ages typically report comparable performance levels, which suggests that factors other than age may be more important in determining an individual's performance outcomes.

3.10.14. Level of Toxic Leadership according to Professional Experience

Table 3.24: Level of Toxic Leadership According to Professional Experience ANOVA Results

Professional Experience	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
5 and below	129	3.54	1.36	4.392	0.005	Between Groups	26.111	4
6-10 year	186	3.92	1.47			Within Groups	784.777	395
11-15 year	46	3.26	1.32			Total	810.888	399
Above 16 year	39	3.32	1.29					
Total	400	3.66	1.42					

According to Table 24's ANOVA results, there are notable variations in how toxic leadership is perceived at various professional experience levels ($F = 4.392$, $\text{Sig.} = 0.005$). Those with 6–10 years of experience reported the highest mean score for toxic leadership ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.47$), indicating that they have a stronger perception of toxic leadership behaviors than other groups. The lowest levels of toxic leadership, on the other hand, were reported by those with 11–15 years ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 1.32$) and more than 16 years ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.29$), indicating a less

unfavorable opinion. Between these two extremes were workers with fewer than five years of experience ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.36$).

These results imply that employees' opinions of toxic leadership are significantly influenced by their professional experience. Employees with six to ten years of experience may be in a career stage where they are heavily involved in organizational procedures and leadership practices, which makes them more susceptible to poor leadership practices. Longer-tenured workers, on the other hand, might have modified expectations or created coping mechanisms that lessen their sense of toxic leadership. The notable variations emphasize how crucial it is to take employee experience levels into account when assessing the efficacy of leaders and creating leadership intervention or development initiatives inside businesses.

3.10.15. Level of Servant Leadership Behavior according to Professional Experience

Table 3.25: Level of Servant Leadership Behavior According to Professional Experience
ANOVA Results

Professional Experience	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
5 and below	129	4.87	1.21	0.184	0.907	Between Groups	0.769	4
6-10 year	186	4.94	1.21			Within Groups	552.719	395
11-15 year	46	5.01	0.99			Total	553.489	399
Above 16 year	39	4.95	1.08					
Total	400	4.92	1.17					

There are no discernible variations in servant leadership behavior among professional experience levels, according to the ANOVA results shown in Table 25 ($F = 0.184$, $Sig. = 0.907$). With standard deviations displaying a comparable degree of variation, the mean scores for each group are rather close, ranging from 4.87 (5 years and under) to 5.01 (11–15 years). This suggests that workers' opinions of servant leadership are consistently favorable and steady, irrespective of

their level of professional experience, whether they are mid-level, early in their careers, or seasoned.

This group-to-group consistency indicates that servant leadership is a leadership approach that works equally well for workers at various phases of their careers. In contrast to toxic leadership, which varied according to experience, servant leadership seems to be universally accepted and appreciated. The findings suggest that servant leadership traits like empathy, support, humility, and putting followers' needs first are valued by all and are not significantly impacted by an employee's length of service. This demonstrates how servant leadership is widely applicable and accepted as a positive leadership style within the company, despite a wide range of professional experience levels.

3.10.16. Individual Performance according to Professional Experience

Table 3.26: Level of individual Performance According to Professional Experience ANOVA Results

Professional Experience	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
5 and below	129	5.23	0.93	0.250	0.862	Between Groups	0.815	4
6-10 year	186	5.14	1.10			Within Groups	431.060	395
11-15 year	46	5.16	1.05			Total	431.875	399
Above 16 year	39	5.09	1.06					
Total	400	5.17	1.04					

Individual performance across different levels of professional experience does not differ statistically significantly, according to the ANOVA results in Table 26 ($F = 0.250$, $\text{Sig.} = 0.862$). With standard deviations displaying only slight variation, the mean scores for each group are extremely close, ranging from 5.09 (above 16 years) to 5.23 (5 years and below). This indicates that workers generally report comparable levels of individual performance, irrespective of whether they are just starting their careers or have many years of work experience. Performance

is consistently maintained across all experience levels, as evidenced by the small variations in mean values.

These results imply that organizational elements—such as leadership style, work environment, and resources—likely have a greater impact on individual performance in the investigated organization than does the duration of employees' professional experience. The consistency also shows that while senior employees uphold their performance standards despite their longer tenure, new hires quickly adjust and contribute effectively. Put another way, performance seems to be a shared result of leadership support and organizational culture rather than a result of experience alone. This emphasizes how crucial managerial and structural factors are to maintaining employee productivity.

3.10.17. Level of Toxic Leadership according to Academic Qualification

Table 3.27: Level of Toxic Leadership According to Academic Qualification ANOVA Results

academic qualification	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
Diploma	89	3.50	1.43	2.124	0.097	Between Groups	12.839	4
Bachelor	240	3.65	1.45			Within Groups	798.049	395
Professional	23	3.46	1.12			Total	810.888	399
Graduate	48	4.11	1.30					
Total	400	3.66	1.42					

According to Table 27's ANOVA results, respondents with varying academic backgrounds have somewhat different mean toxic leadership scores. The mean score was 3.50 for those with a diploma, 3.65 for those with a bachelor's degree, 3.46 for those with professional qualifications, and 4.11 for those with a graduate degree. Within each qualification category, the standard deviations, which range from 1.12 to 1.45, indicate a moderate degree of variability in perceptions. The differences between these groups are not statistically significant at the 0.05 threshold, according to the F-value of 2.124 and the two-tailed significance level of 0.097. The

difference between groups may be due to chance rather than a real difference associated with academic credentials, even though graduate degree holders seem to perceive higher levels of toxic leadership.

This interpretation is further supported by the sum of squares results, which show that the within-groups variation (798.049) is larger than the between-groups variation (12.839). This indicates that rather than between educational levels, the majority of the variation in toxic leadership perceptions happens within each qualification group. The null hypothesis is upheld because the p-value is higher than the traditional 0.05 cutoff, indicating that perceptions of toxic leadership in this sample are not significantly impacted by academic background. These results suggest that respondents' opinions on toxic leadership are generally similar, irrespective of their educational background, indicating that these perceptions may be more influenced by other factors, such as exposure to leadership or the work environment.

3.10.18. Level of Servant Leadership Behavior according to Academic Qualification

Table 3.28: Level of Servant Leadership Behavior According to Academic Qualification
ANOVA Results

Academic Qualification	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
Diploma	89	4.85	1.07	1.418	0.237	Between Groups	5.881	4
Bachelor	240	4.88	1.29			Within Groups	547.608	395
Professional	23	5.25	0.84			Total	553.489	399
Graduate	48	5.15	1.17					
Total	400	4.92						

The average opinions of servant leadership behavior vary slightly amongst academic qualification groups, according to the ANOVA results in Table 28. The mean score was 4.85 for those with a diploma, 4.88 for those with a bachelor's degree, 5.25 for those with professional

qualifications, and 5.15 for those with graduate degrees. Within each group, the standard deviations range from 0.84 to 1.29, indicating comparatively low to moderate variability. The two-tailed significance level of 0.237 and the F-value of 1.418 indicate that these differences are not statistically significant. Even though those with graduate and professional degrees reported somewhat higher servant leadership scores, there doesn't seem to be enough variation between the groups to draw any firm conclusions about the relationship between academic background and servant leadership perception.

This interpretation is supported by the sum of squares results, which show that the within-groups variation (547.608) is greater than the between-groups variation (5.881). This suggests that rather than between academic qualification groups, the majority of the variation in servant leadership behavior perceptions occurs within each group. The null hypothesis is upheld because the p-value is greater than the 0.05 cutoff, indicating that academic background has no discernible impact on the perception of servant leadership behavior. The findings indicate that respondents generally hold similar opinions about servant leadership, irrespective of their educational background. This suggests that other factors, like workplace culture, supervisors' leadership styles, or organizational values, may have a greater influence on how respondents perceive servant leadership.

3.10.19. Level of Individual Performance according to Academic Qualification

Table 3.29: Level of Individual Performance According to Academic Qualification

Academic Qualification	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig 2 tailed	Sum of Squares		df
Diploma	89	5.06	1.06	1.343	0.260	Between Groups	4.349	4
Bachelor	240	5.22	1.02			Within Groups	427.526	395
Professional	23	4.86	1.37			Total	431.875	399
Graduate	48	5.25	0.87					
Total	400	5.17	1.04					

According to the ANOVA results in Table 29, the mean individual performance scores for each academic qualification group differ slightly: those with a diploma score 5.06, a bachelor's degree score 5.22, a professional qualification score of 4.86, and a graduate degree score of 5.25. Within groups, standard deviations range from 0.87 to 1.37, indicating low to moderate variability. These differences are not statistically significant, according to the F-value of 1.343 and the significance level of 0.260, indicating that chance rather than educational background is probably the cause of performance score variations. The fact that the within-groups sum of squares (427.526) is larger than the between-groups sum of squares (4.349) further supports the idea that the majority of variability occurs within groups. Overall, academic credentials don't seem to have a big impact on how people perceive their own performance, which suggests that other elements like job role, workplace culture, or personal drive might be more important.

3.11 RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TESTS

A key component of quantitative research is the test of hypotheses, which enables the investigator to ascertain whether the initial assumptions of the study are validated by the information gathered. In order to investigate the relationships or differences between variables, each hypothesis is statistically tested using techniques like regression, t-tests, correlation, and ANOVA. The significance level (p-value) and test statistics, which show whether the observed results could have happened by chance, determine whether a hypothesis should be accepted or rejected. The hypothesis is accepted as statistically significant if the p-value is less than the selected threshold, which is typically 0.05; a higher p-value results in rejection.

Table 3.30: Test Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Results
H01: There is a correlation between Toxic Leadership, servant leadership and individual performance.	Accepted
H02: There is a significant effect of leadership different styles on individual performance.	Accepted
H03: There is a significant effect of servant leadership on individual performance.	Accepted
H04: There is a significant difference in the level of Toxic Leadership according to gender.	Rejected
H05: There is a significant difference in the level of servant leadership behavior according to gender.	Rejected
H06: There is a significant difference in the level of individual Performance according to gender.	Rejected

CONCLUSION

This section discusses the key findings of the study, interpreting the results in the context of existing literature and offering explanations for the observed relationships between servant leadership, toxic leadership, and individual performance.

The high internal consistency of the measurement tools used for individual performance, servant leadership, and toxic leadership provides a strong foundation for the study's validity. The reliability of these instruments, as evidenced by consistent response patterns, logically increases confidence in the findings, suggesting that the results are not merely a product of measurement error. This allows for valid conclusions regarding the relationships between the variables.

A central finding of this study is the reported higher prevalence of toxic leadership behaviors compared to servant leadership. This observation may reflect an organizational culture, common in many contexts including the one under study, that implicitly values authority, control, and compliance over support and empowerment. In environments facing rapid change or external pressures, toxic behaviors like micromanagement and blame-shifting can become entrenched as dominant leadership patterns, often reinforced by a focus on short-term performance indicators. Conversely, servant leadership, which requires a high degree of emotional intelligence, self-awareness, and a long-term developmental perspective, may be less common as it challenges traditional, top-down power structures prevalent in many corporate settings.

The study confirmed a significant negative relationship between toxic leadership and individual performance. This can be interpreted through the psychological and emotional repercussions of such leadership. Toxic behaviors create an atmosphere of fear, anxiety, and disengagement, which systematically erodes employees' intrinsic motivation. This not only diminishes productivity but also stifles initiative, creativity, and teamwork. It logically follows that employees operating under such conditions perform below their potential. In contrast, servant leadership was found to have a

positive impact on performance. By fostering an environment of respect, empathy, and trust, servant leaders inspire loyalty and dedication. Employees who feel their development and well-being are genuinely cared for are more likely to take ownership of their tasks and go beyond their formal duties. This supportive approach enhances psychological safety, a key driver of innovation and sustained high performance.

Interestingly, the study found no significant difference in the perceptions of leadership styles between male and female respondents. This suggests that both genders are exposed to and interpret these behaviors in a similar manner, indicating a consistent leadership environment where the impact of servant or toxic behaviors transcends gender lines. This finding strengthens the case for universal leadership development initiatives that benefit the entire workforce, rather than programs targeted at specific gender-based subgroups.

The analysis of demographic factors yielded further nuanced insights. Younger employees appeared to be more susceptible to the negative effects of toxic leadership. This heightened sensitivity may be attributed to their career stage, where they often enter the workforce with expectations of mentorship and constructive guidance. Toxic behaviors violate these expectations, leading to increased stress and disillusionment. Middle-aged employees, on the other hand, reported a higher frequency of exposure to toxic leadership. This could be due to their position in the organizational hierarchy, where they are senior enough to face high expectations but not yet powerful enough to shield themselves from poor leadership. The pressure to succeed at this career stage may also make the impact of negative leadership more pronounced.

The finding that demographic factors like age and experience have no overarching, direct effect on performance levels suggests that environmental and contextual factors, such as leadership style, play a more dominant role than innate individual traits. This aligns with research indicating that job conditions, role clarity, and resource availability are stronger predictors of performance than demographic

characteristics. It underscores the importance of addressing systemic organizational issues rather than focusing solely on individual-level variations. While toxic leadership demonstrated a detrimental effect on performance, it did not fully account for all variations in employee output. This reinforces the understanding that performance is multi-determined; factors such as team dynamics, individual resilience, and job design also play significant roles. The extent to which toxic leadership translates into poorer performance may be moderated by an employee's coping mechanisms or the presence of supportive colleagues.

The logical thread uniting these findings is the critical role of leadership in shaping the employee experience. Servant leadership cultivates trust, dedication, and engagement, while toxic leadership undermines these foundations. However, leadership is just one component of a larger organizational ecosystem that includes strategy, structure, and culture. Therefore, to foster sustainable performance and organizational well-being, a holistic approach is required—one that involves not only training individual leaders but also investing in systems and values that reinforce positive, supportive behaviors across the entire organization.

This study investigated the impact of two opposing leadership paradigms (servant and toxic leadership) on individual employee performance within the specific context of business companies in Northern Iraq. The findings provide a clear and compelling picture of the critical role leadership plays in shaping organizational outcomes in this region.

The results of this study confirm that servant leadership has a significant positive influence on individual performance. This finding is consistent with a robust body of international literature. For example, a comprehensive meta-analysis by Chaudhry et al. (2015) demonstrated that servant leadership behaviors are strong predictors of enhanced job performance, creativity, and organizational citizenship. Similarly, recent research in other emerging economies, such as the Pakistani banking sector, has also affirmed this positive relationship, highlighting the style's cross-cultural relevance. The mechanism driving this effect, as suggested by our data, appears to be

the cultivation of trust and psychological safety, which aligns with the findings of Saleem et al. (2020), who identified affective trust as a key mediator between servant leadership and positive employee outcomes.

Conversely, the research provides strong evidence that toxic leadership is profoundly detrimental to individual performance. This conclusion is overwhelmingly supported by recent global studies. A meta-review by Lee et al. (2024) unequivocally linked toxic leadership to negative outcomes, including diminished job performance, lower job satisfaction, and eroded psychological safety. This corrosive effect has also been documented in other emerging economies like Indonesia, where toxic behaviors were found to negatively impact motivation and employee well-being. Our study contributes to this consensus by confirming the damaging impact of toxic leadership within the Northern Iraqi business environment, where such behaviors can severely undermine morale and productivity.

A particularly noteworthy finding from this study is the reported prevalence of toxic leadership behaviors over servant leadership practices among the surveyed organizations. This suggests the presence of entrenched structural or cultural barriers that may favor hierarchical, command-and-control styles over more supportive, people-centric approaches. This dynamic, where authority is prioritized, can inadvertently create fertile ground for toxic behaviors to emerge and persist.

Furthermore, the study revealed that demographic factors such as gender and professional experience had a minimal impact on the relationship between leadership styles and performance. This suggests that the influence of a leader's behavior is powerful and consistent across diverse employee groups. However, a slight nuance was observed where younger and mid-career employees demonstrated a heightened sensitivity to toxic leadership, which may be attributable to their developmental stage and relative vulnerability within organizational power structures.

In conclusion, this research presents a clear dichotomy for organizations in Northern Iraq. The path to enhancing individual performance, fostering employee well-being, and achieving sustainable success is paved with the principles of servant leadership.

By prioritizing trust, empowerment, and ethical conduct, leaders can unlock the full potential of their workforce. In contrast, the tolerance of toxic leadership represents a direct path to organizational decay, characterized by disengagement, high turnover, and diminished productivity. The choice for leaders and organizations in this region is stark: to build a culture of service that elevates performance or to permit a culture of toxicity that corrodes it from within.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed. These are divided into two distinct categories: practical recommendations for organizations and leaders operating in Northern Iraq, and recommendations for future academic research to build upon the insights gained from this study.

Practical Recommendations for Organizations

1. **Promote and Cultivate Servant Leadership:** Given the clear positive impact of servant leadership on individual performance, organizations in Northern Iraq should actively invest in leadership development programs. These programs should focus on instilling core servant leadership values such as empathy, active listening, employee empowerment, and a commitment to professional growth.

2. **Actively Combat Toxic Leadership:** To mitigate the damaging effects of toxic behaviors, organizations must establish clear, zero-tolerance policies. This should be supported by creating confidential and safe reporting channels that protect employees from retaliation, ensuring that toxic behaviors are identified and addressed swiftly and decisively.

3. **Integrate Servant Leadership into Talent Management:** To ensure a sustainable pipeline of effective leaders, servant leadership criteria should be embedded into recruitment and promotion processes. Priority for leadership positions should be given to individuals who consistently demonstrate empathy, integrity, and a commitment to serving their teams, rather than those who exhibit authoritarian tendencies.

4. **Build a Resilient Culture of Trust and Psychological Safety:** Beyond individual leaders, organizations should invest in system-wide initiatives that foster

transparency, open communication, and mutual trust. A strong, positive culture can act as a buffer, reducing the negative impact of any lingering toxic behaviors and amplifying the effectiveness of servant leadership.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. In-depth Qualitative Studies: To move beyond the "what" to the "how" and "why," future research should employ qualitative methods. In-depth interviews or focus groups with employees in Northern Iraq could provide rich, contextual narratives of their firsthand experiences with servant and toxic leaders.

2. Longitudinal Research: To understand the long-term consequences of these leadership styles, longitudinal studies are needed. Tracking key metrics like employee performance, turnover rates, and well-being over several years would provide stronger evidence of the causal impact of servant and toxic leadership.

3. Examination of Mediating and Moderating Variables: Future quantitative studies could build on this research by investigating the role of key variables. For instance, does organizational culture moderate the impact of toxic leadership? Does psychological safety mediate the relationship between servant leadership and innovation?

4. Comparative Cross-Regional Studies: To test the generalizability of these results, comparative studies are recommended. Comparing the findings from Northern Iraq with other regions in Iraq or with similar emerging economies would help isolate which leadership dynamics are universal and which are context-specific.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, J. (2020). Impact of total quality management on corporate sustainability through the mediating effect of knowledge management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 55-63.
- ABU-TAYEH, B. K., AL-HAYARI, K., ve AL-QATAWNEH, M. I. (2012). The Relationship between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction in Some Jordanian Business Organizations. *Journal of the Islamic University for Economic and Administrative Studies*, 20, 155-170.
- ABUZAIDA, Z. (2011). The Impact of the Application of the Concept of Total Quality Management on Organizational Performance, An Applied Study in a Sample of the Commercial Banks of Palestine. *Journal of An-Najah University*, 25(4), 872-890.
- Adair, W. S., Hwang, C., ve Goodenough, U. W. (1983). Identification and visualization of the sexual agglutinin from the mating-type plus flagellar membrane of *Chlamydomonas*. *Cell*, 33(1), 183-193.
- Adel Hadi Al-Baghdadi, H. F. D. A. (2010). *Organizational Education and the Learning Organization and their Relationship to Contemporary Administrative Concepts*. Al-Warraq Publishing.
- Afshan, N., Govindarajulu, C., Subramanian, G., Gunasekaran, A., ve Motwani, J. (2024). Supply chain integration and performance paradox: is relational performance the missing link?. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*, 1-25.
- AFT, R. (2004). *Organization theory & design* (8. Baskı). Thomson southwestern.
- Agarwal, S. (2020). Leadership Style and Performance of Employees. *International Research Journal of Business Studies*, 13, 1-14.
- Ahmad, S., Islam, T., Sohal, A.S., Wolfram Cox, J., ve Kaleem, A. (2021). Managing bullying in the workplace: a model of servant leadership, employee resilience and proactive personality. *Personnel Review*.
- Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018). Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 1-10.
- Al-Abadi B, H. F. D. (2007). The Role of Visual Management Strategies in the Success of the Work of the University Administration to Achieve Outstanding Performance, An Applied Study at the University of Kufa. *Journal of Administrative Studies, College of Administration and Economics - University of Basra*, 1(3).
- AL-AHMADI, M. E. (2001). Use of brainstorming method in the development of creative thinking skills and its impact on the written expression of thirdgrade students [Yayımlanmamış]. Faculty of Education for Girls University of Tabuk.
- AL-HUSSEINI, A. (1994). The relationship of administrative supervision to the efficiency of the performance of employees: an applied study on military hospitals in Riyadh [Yayımlanmamış].
- AL-Qaryouti, M. Q. (2000). *Organizational Behavior: A Study of Individual and Collective Human Behavior in Different Organizations*. Dar Al-Shorouk for Publishing and Distribution.

- Ardichvili, A., ve Dirani, K. M. (2017). Leadership development in emerging market economies. A. Ardichvili ve K. M. Dirani (Ed.), *Palgrave Studies of Internationalization in Emerging Markets* içinde (1–12). Springer Nature.
- Argyris, C. (1991). Teaching smart people how to learn. *Harvard Business Review*, 69(3).
- Arthur, J. B. (1994). Effects of Human Resource Systems on Manufacturing Performance and Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 670–687.
- Aubrey, D. W. (2012). The effect of toxic leadership. US Army War College.
- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations*. Sage.
- Avolio, B. J., ve Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338.
- Axson, D. A. (2010). *Best practices in planning and performance management: radically rethinking management for a volatile world*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Aycan, Z. (2007). Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization. *Scientific Advances and Indigenous Psychologies: Empirical, Philosophical, and Cultural Contributions* (4-45). Cambridge University.
- Baig, S., Iqbal, S., Abrar, M., Baig, I., Amjad, F., Zia-Ur-Rehman, M., ve Awan, M. (2019). Impact of leadership styles on employees' performance with moderating role of positive psychological capital. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32, 1085-1105.
- Bailey, C. T. (1983). *The measurement of job performance*. Gower.
- Baporikar, N. (2017). *Management Education for Global Leadership*. IGI Global.
- Barker, R. A. (2001). The nature of leadership. *Human Relations*, 54(4), 469-494.
- Barrena, J. M., Fernández, M. L., ve Fernández, P. M. (2019). Towards a configuration of socially responsible human resource management policies and practices: findings from an academic consensus. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32-36.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., ve Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1/2), 9-30.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bass, B. M., ve Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., ve Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2. Baskı). Psychology Press.
- Beaton, D., Bombardier, C., Escorpizo, R., ve diğerleri. (2009). Measuring worker productivity: Frameworks and measures. *Journal of Rheumatology*, 36(9), 2100-2109.
- Belton, V., ve Stewart, T. (2002). *Multiple criteria decision analysis: an integrated approach*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bennis, W., ve Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*. Harper & Row.

- Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G. M., Shaikh, N., Hashmi, M. A., ve Shaikh, F. M. (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction. *International Business Research*, 5(2), 192.
- Biloe, X. (2023). The Impact of Leadership Style on Employee Job Performance.
- Bingham, W. V. (1926). Measures of occupational success. *Harvard Business Review*, 5(1), 1–10.
- Bisheen, A. (2024). Assessing the role of Leadership styles on employee performance, organizational commitment as mediator variable in Asiacele Iraq. *International Journal of Management and Organizational Research*.
- Blair, J. D., ve Rivera, J. B. (1992). A Stakeholder Management Perspective on Strategic Leadership. R. L. Phillips ve J. G. Hunt (Ed.), *Strategic Leadership: A Multiorganizational-Level Perspective* içinde (84). Quorum Books.
- Blake, R. R., ve Mouton, J. S. (1964). The Managerial Grid. *Advanced Management Office Executive*, 3(9), 7-12.
- Blanchard, K. (2007). *Leading at a higher level*. Prentice Hall.
- Bland Mohammed Ghafor. (2018). The Impact of Strategic Planning On Organizational Performance [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Bingöl Üniversitesi.
- Boal, K. B., ve Schultz, P. L. (2007). Storytelling, Time, and Evolution: The Role of Strategic Leadership in Complex Adaptive Systems. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 411.
- Book Chapters:
- Braham, J. (1999). The spiritual side. *Industry Week*, 48-56.
- Brewer, C. (2010). Servant leadership: A review of literature. *Online Journal for Workforce Education and Development*, 4(2), 3.
- Brown, M. E., ve Treviño, L. K. (2016). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(4), 581-596.
- Bunteng, L. (2022). Factors Affecting Organizational Performance: A Study on Four Factors Motivation, Ability, Roles, and Organizational Support.
- Cadin L., G. F. ve P. F. (2007). *Gestion des ressources humaines* (3. Baskı). Dunod.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. M. D. Dunnette ve L. M. Hough (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* içinde (687-732). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. M. D. Dunnette ve L. M. Hough (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (1. Cilt) içinde (687–732). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- CERTO, S. C., PETER, J., ve PAUL, O. E. (1995). *The Strategic Management Process* (3. Baskı). Richard D, Irwin, INC.
- Chaurasia, S., ve Shukla, A. (2013). The influence of leader-member exchange relations on employee engagement and work role performance. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 16(4), 465–493.
- Chiang, C.-F., ve Hsieh, T.-S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 180–190.

- Chin, R. (2015). Examining teamwork and leadership in the fields of public administration, leadership, and management. *Team Performance Management*, 21(3/4), 199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-07-2014-0037>
- Cho, O.-H., Park, K.-H., Kim, S.-M., Park, S.-J., Moon, S. M., Chong, Y. P., Sung, H., Kim, M.-N., Jeong, J.-Y., Lee, S.-O., Choi, S.-H., Woo, J. H., Kim, Y. S., ve Kim, S.-H. (2011). Diagnostic performance of T-SPOT.TB for extrapulmonary tuberculosis according to the site of infection. *Journal of Infection*, 63(5), 362–369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2011.06.010>
- Chua, S. M. Y., ve Murray, D. W. (2015). How toxic leaders are perceived: Gender and information-processing. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(3), 10.
- CHUNGYAS, J. I., ve TRINIDAD PH.D., F. L. (2022). Strategic management practices and business performance of cooperatives in Ifugao, Philippines: Basis for strategic Planning Model. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 4(2), 84–104. <https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v4i2.293>
- Cokins, G. (2009). *Performance management: integrating strategy execution, methodologies, risk, and analytics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cooke, F. (2001). Human resource strategy to improve organizational performance: a route for firms in Britain. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(4), 321-339. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00071>
- Costello, A. B., ve Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 10(1), 1–9.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (4. Baskı). SAGE Publications.
- Daft, R. L. (2006). *The New Era of Management* (Uluslararası Baskı). Thomson.
- Damanpour, F., Szabat, K. A., ve Evan, W. M. (1989). The relationship between types of innovation and organizational performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 26(6), 587-602.
- Day, D. V., ve Antonakis, J. (2018). *The nature of leadership*. SAGE Publications.
- Deci, E. L., ve Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Develi, A. (2020). Çalışma yeterliliği, iş tatmini ve görev performansı ilişkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Osmaniye Korkut Ata Üniversitesi.
- Dhawan, V., ve Mulla, Z. R. (2011). The role of pay and leadership in developing organizational commitment. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 18, 60-75.
- Diala, I., ve Nemani, R. (2011). Job Satisfaction: Key Factors Influencing Information Technology (IT) Professionals in Washington DC. *International Journal of Computer Technology and Applications*, 2(4), 827–838.
- Dimitrios, N. K., Sakas, D. P., ve Vlachos, D. S. (2013a). Analysis of Strategic Leadership Models in Information Technology. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 73, 270.

- Doh, J. P., ve Quigley, N. R. (2014). Responsible leadership and stakeholder management: Influence pathways and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28, 255-274.
- Drucker, P. F. (2008). *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*. HarperCollins.
- Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., ve Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1715-1759.
- Duursema, H. H. (2013). Strategic Leadership: Moving beyond the leader-follower dyad (No. EPS-2013-279-ORG).
- Eagly, A. H., ve Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 781-797.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., Dierendonck, D., ve Liden, R. (2019). Servant Leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
- Farhad Zare, A. M. A., ve B. (2012). Proposing a meta-heuristic method for solving network problems. *Journal of Innovation and Creativity in Human Science*, 1(3), 167.
- Fay, D., ve Sonnentag, S. (2010). A look back to move ahead: New directions for research on proactive performance and other discretionary work behaviors. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 59(1), 1-20.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5. Baskı)*. SAGE Publications.
- Flynn, G. (1999). Cover Story Package-Stop Toxic Managers before They Stop You!. *Workforce-Boulder*, 40-46.
- Foels, R., Driskell, J. E., Mullen, B., ve Salas, E. (2000). The effects of democratic leadership on group member satisfaction: An integration. *Small Group Research*, 31(6), 676-701.
- Gabriela, E. C. (2020). Organizational performance – theoretical and practical approaches; study on students' perceptions.
- Gandolfi, F., ve Stone, S. (2018). Leadership, leadership styles, and servant leadership. *Journal of Management and Research*, 18, 261-269.
- Ganta, V. C. (2014). Motivation in the workplace to improve the employee performance. *International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences*, 2(6), 221–230.
- Garandai, E. (2021). The role of career satisfaction in the relationship between work overload and individual performance.
- Gardner, W. L., Karam, E. P., Alvesson, M., ve Einola, K. (2021). Authentic leadership theory: The case for and against. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(6), 101495.
- Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. B., Mahoney, K. T., ve Coglisier, C. C. (2010). Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: A review of *The Leadership Quarterly's* second decade, 2000-2009. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 922-958.
- Geer, B. W., Maher, J. K., ve Cole, M. T. (2008). Managing nonprofit organizations: The importance of transformational leadership and commitment to operating

- standards for nonprofit accountability. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 32(1), 51-75.
- George, J. M., ve Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(2), 310.
- Ghafour, B. M. (2019). The impact of strategic planning on organizational performance: A study of private hospitals in Erbil city [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Bingöl University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 4–17.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., ve McKee, A. (2013). *Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence*. Harvard Business Press.
- Gonos, J., ve Gallo, P. (2013). Model for leadership style evaluation. *Management: Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, 18(2), 157-168.
- Gonzaga University, ve Robert K. Greenleaf Center. (2005). *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership*, 1(1), 3-27.
- Graen, G., ve Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-Based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership Over 25 Years: Applying a Multi-Level Multi-Domain Perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant Leadership A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1991). *The servant as leader*. The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2013). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., ve Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327-347.
- Hackman, J. R. (1976). Motivation through the design work: Test of the theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*.
- Hackman, M. Z., ve Johnson, C. E. (2009). *Leadership*. Waveland Press Inc.
- Hadadian, Z., ve Zarei, J. (2016). Relationship between toxic leadership and job stress of knowledge workers. *Studies in Business and Economics*, 11(3), 84-89.
- Haerofiatna, E., Erlangga, H., Mulyana, Y., Sunarsi, D., ve Solahudin, M. (2021). The Effect of Organizational Commitment and Work Environment on Job Satisfaction and Teachers Performance. 12(7), 109–117.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis: Pearson New International Edition (7th ed.)*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., ve Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis (7. Baskı)*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Halbeslebe, J. R. B., Wheeler, A. R., ve Buckley, M. R. (2007). Clarifying the relationship between organizational commitment and job performance: Extending the conservation of resources model. K. H. Kiefer (Ed.), *Applied psychology research trends içinde* (67-88). Nova Science Publishers.

- Hanafi Mahmoud Suleiman. (1999). *Organizational Behavior and Performance*. Egyptian Universities House.
- Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., ve Fry, L. W. (2011). Leadership in action teams: team leader and members' authenticity, authenticity strength, and team outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(3), 771–802.
- Harbour, J. (2009). *The performance paradox: Understanding the real drivers that critically affect outcomes*. Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- Harwiki, W. (2016). The impact of servant leadership on organization culture, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and employee performance in women cooperatives. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 283-290.
- Haspeslagh, P. C., ve Jemison, D. B. (1987). SMR FORUM Acquisitions Myths and Reality. *Sloan Management Review* (1986-1998), 28(2), 53.
- Heppell, T. (2011). "Toxic leadership: Applying the Lipman-Blumen model to political leadership." *Representation*, 47(3), 241-249.
- Herbert, J. (2000). The changing face of journalism education in the UK. *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 8(1), 113-23.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., ve Natemeyer, W. E. (1979). Situational leadership, perception, and the impact of power. *Group & Organization Studies*, 4(4), 418-428.
- Hersey, P., ve Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources* (2. Baskı). Prentice-Hall.
- Hettiarachchi, S., ve Das, A. (2014). Perceptions of 'inclusion' and perceived preparedness among school teachers in Sri Lanka. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 43, 143–153.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 321-339.
- House, R. J. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hu, N., Chen, Z., Gu, J., Huang, S., ve Liu, H. (2017). Conflict and creativity in inter-organizational teams. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 28(1), 74–102.
- Hu, W. H., Eisenstein, S., Parry, L., ve Ramamoorthy, S. (2019). Preoperative malnutrition with mild hypoalbuminemia associated with postoperative mortality and morbidity of colorectal cancer: a propensity score matching study. *Nutrition Journal*, 18, 1-7.
- Hunt, J. G. (1991). *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Sage Publisher.
- Hunt, S. (2007). *Hiring success: The art and science of staffing assessment and employee selection*. John Wiley & Sons, Lt.
- Igbaekemen, G. O. (2014). Impact of leadership style on organisation performance: A strategic literature review. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 4(9), 126-135.
- Ilgen, D. R. (1999). Teams embedded in organizations: Some implications. *American Psychologist*, 54, 129–139.
- Imran, M., Ismail, F., Arshad, I., Zeb, F., ve Zahid, H. (2021). The mediating role of innovation in the relationship between organizational culture and

- organizational performance in Pakistan's banking sector. *Journal of Public Affairs*, July.
- Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., ve Haider, N. (2015). Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5, 1-6.
- Ireland, R. D., ve Hitt, M. A. (1999). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: the role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Strategic Management Executive*, 13(1), 43-57.
- Javed, B., Khan, A. A., ve Qureshi, M. A. (2024). Responsible leadership in emerging economies: Challenges, requirements and profile. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 56(1), a5312. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v56i1.5312>
- Kaltiainen, J., ve Hakanen, J. (2020). Fostering task and adaptive performance through employee well-being: The role of servant leadership. *Business Research Quarterly*, 25, 28-43.
- Kaner, S. (2014). *Facilitator's guide to participatory decision-making*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Karnes, F. A., Bean, S. M., ve Wallner, R. (1993). *Girls and Young Women Leading the Way: 20 True Stories about Leadership*. Free Spirit Publishing, Inc.
- Kemppila, S., ve Lonnqvist, A. (2003). Subjective productivity measurement. *The Journal of the American Academy of Business*, 2(2), 531-537.
- Khan, V., Hafeez, M.H., Rizvi, S.M.H., Hasnain, A., ve Mariam, A. (2012). Relationship of Leadership Styles, Employees Commitment and Organisation Performance (A Study on Customer Support Representatives). *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 49, 134-142.
- Kim, M. H. (2022). Transformational, Transactional Leadership, and Perceptions of Organizational Performance: The Moderating Role of Relational Authenticity as a Leader. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 18(65), 64-86.
- Kirby, J. (2005). Toward a theory of high performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 83, 30-39.
- Kirkpatrick, D., ve Kirkpatrick, J. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modelling* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kolios, A., Read, G., ve Ioannou, A. (2016). Application of multi-criteria decisionmaking to risk prioritisation in tidal energy developments. *International Journal of Sustainable Energy*, 35(1), 59-74.
- Koohang, A., Paliszkievicz, J., ve Goluchowski, J. (2017). The impact of leadership on trust, knowledge management, and organizational performance: A research model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 117(3), 521-537.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., de Vet, H. C. W., ve van der Beek, A. J. (2014). Construct validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 56(3), 331-337.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet, H. C. W., ve van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work

- performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856–866.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2. Baskı). New Age International (P) Ltd., Publishers.
- Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The Leadership Factor*. Collier Macmillan Publishers.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*. Free Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (1999). John P. Kotter on What Leaders Really Do. President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- Kouzes, J. M., ve Posner, B. Z. (2006). *The leadership challenge* (3. Cilt). John Wiley & Sons.
- Kouzes, J. M., ve Posner, B. Z. (2017). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations* (6. Baskı). Jossey-Bass.
- Kumar, C. R. (2007). *The leadershipinmanagement: Understanding leadershipwisdom*. APH Publishing.
- Kusy, M. E., ve Holloway, E. L. (2009). *Managing toxic personalities and their systems of power* (1. Baskı). Jossey-Bass.
- Lado, A. A., Boyd, N. G., ve Wright, P. (1992). A competency-based model of sustainable competitive advantage: Toward a conceptual integration. *Journal of Management*, 18(1), 77-91.
- Lebas, M. (1995). Performance measurement and performance management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 41(1-3), 23-35.
- Lee and Chuang (2009). *The Impact of Leadership Styles on Job Stress and Turnover Intention: Taiwan Insurance Industry as an Example*. www.hclee@ttu.edu.tw.
- Lee, R. M., ve Robbins, S. B. (1998). The relationship between social connectedness and anxiety, self-esteem, and social identity.
- Leiter, M. P., Laschinger, H. K. S., Day, A., ve Oore, D. G. (2011). The impact of civility interventions on employee social behavior, distress, and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1258–1274.
- Leonard, N. H., Scholl, R. W., ve Kowalski, K. B. (1999). Information processing style and decision making. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 20(3), 407-420.
- Lessem, R. (1991). *Total quality learning*. Blackwell.
- Loftus, E. F., Miller, D. G., ve Burns, H. J. (1978). Semantic integration of verbal information into a visual memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 4(1), 19.
- Lutz Allen, S., Smith, J. E., ve Da Silva, N. (2013). Leadership style in relation to organizational change and organizational creativity: Perceptions from nonprofit organizational members. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 24(1), 23-42.
- Maak, T., ve Pless, N. M. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society – A relational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(1), 99-113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9047-z>

- Mackay, M. (2017). Professional development seen as employment capital. *Professional Development in Education*, 43(1), 140–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2015.1010015>
- MAHER, A. (1999). *Director's Guide Step by Step in Strategic Management*. University House.
- Majumdar, B. (2019). *Mind Tools for Managers-100 Ways to be A Better Boss*. J. Manktelow ve J. Birkinshaw (Ed.), *Abhigyan içinde* (75). Wiley India Pvt. Ltd.
- Maloş, R. (2011). LEADESHIP'S TRAIT THEORIES. *Annals of Eftimie Murgu University Resita, Fascicle II, Economic Studies*.
- Maqableh, M. (2017). The Effect of Intellectual Capital on Organizational Performance: The Mediating Role of Knowledge Sharing. *Communications and Network*, 9, 1-27.
- Martin, R., Guillaume, Y., Thomas, G., Lee, A., ve Epitropaki, O. (2016). Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 69(1), 67-121.
- Martins, E. C., ve Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organizational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1998). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership*. Thomas Nelson Inc.
- MCSHane, S. L., ve von Glinow, M. A. (2000). *Organizational Behavior*. McGraw-Hill.
- Meslec, N., Curşeu, P., Fodor, O., ve Kenda, R. (2020). Effects of charismatic leadership and rewards on individual performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 31, 101423.
- Milošević, I., Maric, S., ve Lončar, D. (2020). Defeating the Toxic Boss: The Nature of Toxic Leadership and the Role of Followers. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27, 117-137.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The Nature of Managerial Work*. Harper & Row.
- Mohamed Hanafi Mohamed Nour Tebedi. (2010). *The Impact of Strategic Management on Performance Efficiency and Effectiveness [Doktora Tezi]*. University of Khartoum.
- Mohammad, H. A. (2012). *The Impact of Business Intelligence and Decision Support on the Quality of Decision Making An Empirical Study on Five Stars Hotels in Amman Capital*.
- Moore, L. L., ve Rudd, R. D. (2006). Leadership styles of current extension leaders. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 47(1), 6.
- Mullins, J. W., ve Forlani, D. (2005). Missing the boat or sinking the boat: A study of new venture decision making. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20(1), 47-69.
- Nagle, B. (1953). Criterion development. *Personnel Psychology*, 6, 271–289.
- Nguyen, T. T. M., ve Nguyen, T. V. (2021). Digital transformation leadership: The impact on Vietnamese enterprises' performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Information Systems*, 31(2), 179–204.
- Northouse, P. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Western Michigan University.
- Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications.

- Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9. Baskı). SAGE Publications.
- Omar Wasfi Aqili. (1991). *Management of the Humanity Response*. Aleppo University.
- Owda, R. O. (2019). *The Reality of Decision Making in NGOs in Gaza Strip*.
- Pandey, P., ve Pandey, M. M. (2015). *Research methodology: Tools and techniques*. Bridge Center.
- Pandey, P., ve Pandey, M. M. (2015). *Research methodology: Tools and techniques*. Bridge Center.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* [Doktora Tezi]. Regent University.
- Pelletier, K. L. (2009). *The effects of favored status and identification with victim on perceptions of and reactions to leader toxicity* [Doktora Tezi]. Claremont Graduate University.
- Qu, S. Q., Maak, T., ve Pless, N. M. (2024). Responsible leadership in global business: A new approach to leadership and its multi-level outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05652-4>
- Quong, T., ve Walker, A. (2010). Seven Principles of Strategic Leadership. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 38(1), 23.
- R. J. House, N. S. Wright, R. N. Aditya (1997). Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. P. C. Earley, M. Erez (Ed.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology içinde* (535-625). Jossey-Bass.
- Rahmatullah, A., ve diğerleri. (2022). Improving organizational performance with organizational culture and transformational leadership through intervening organizational commitment variables. *Dinasti International Journal Of Digital Business Management*, 3(2), 180-194.
- Rasouli, A., K. K. M., Ashja'ardalan, S., Saraee, F., ve Ahmadi, F. Z. (2020). The Importance of Strategic Planning and Management in Health: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Health Management and Informatics*, 7(1), 1-9.
- Reference: Yukl, G. (2019). *Leadership in Organizations* (9. Baskı). Pearson.
- Rhoades, L., ve Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.
- Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Organizational Behavior* (11. Baskı). Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S. P., ve Coulter, M. (2017). *Management* (14. Baskı). Pearson.
- Robbins, S. P., ve Judge, T. (2013). *Organizational behavior*. Pearson Education.
- Robbins, S. P., ve Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational Behavior* (Güncel On Sekizinci Baskı).
- ROGHANIAN, P., RASLI, A., ve GHEYSARI, H. (2012). Productivity through effectiveness and efficiency in the banking industry. *Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, 550–556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.229>
- Rolstadås, A. (1998). Enterprise performance measurement. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 18(9/10), 989–999.
- Rosenfeld, L. B., ve Plax, T. G. (1975). Personality determinants of autocratic and democratic leadership. *Communications Monographs*, 42(3), 203-208.

- Roter, A. B. (2011). The lived experiences of registered nurses exposed to toxic leadership behaviors [Doktora Tezi]. CAPELLA UNIVERSITY.
- Rowold, J., Borgmann, L., ve Bormann, K. (2014). Which leadership constructs are important for predicting job satisfaction, affective commitment, and perceived job performance in profit versus nonprofit organizations? *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 25(2), 147-164.
- Rowold, J., ve Rohmann, A. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership styles, followers' positive and negative emotions, and performance in German nonprofit orchestras. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 20(1), 41-59.
- Sager, J. K., ve Johnston, M. W. (1989). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment: A study of salespeople. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 9(1), 30-41.
- Saleem, F., Zhang, Y. Z., Gopinath, C., ve Adeel, A. (2020). Impact of Servant Leadership on Performance: The Mediating Role of Affective and Cognitive Trust. *SAGE Open*, 10(1).
- Savery, L. K., ve Syme, P. D. (1996). Organizational commitment and hospital pharmacists. *Journal of Management Development*, 15(1), 14-22.
- Schmidt, A. (2008). Toxic leadership. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Leadership* (4. Cilt) içinde (1603-1606). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Schultz, A. B., Chen, C. Y., ve Edgington, D. W. (2009). The cost and impact of health conditions on presenteeism to employers. *Pharmacoeconomics*, 27(5), 365-378.
- Sendjaya, S. (2015). *Personal and organizational excellence through servant leadership*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Sendjaya, S., Eva, N., Butar Butar, I., Robin, M., ve Castles, S. (2019). SLBS-6: Validation of a short form of the servant leadership behavior scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156, 941-956.
- Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness 25th Anniversary Edition Hardcover – Deluxe Edition, November 1, 2002, by Robert K. Greenleaf (Author). (2002). Paulist Press.
- Sharon B. Buchbinder ve Nancy H. Shanks. (2016). *Introduction to Health Care Management* (3. Baskı). Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Shollo, A. D. (2013). *The Role of Business Intelligence in Organizational Decision-making*.
- Sianturi, S., Wardi, Y., ve Thaib, I. (2024). Improving Individual and Team Performance Through the Concept of Servant Leadership in the Work Environment: Literature Review. *Dinasti International Journal of Education Management And Social Science*.
- Singh, S., Sidhu, J., Joshi, M., ve Kansal, M. (2016). Measuring intellectual capital performance of Indian banks. *Managerial Finance*, 42(7), 635-655.
- Smith, M., ve Bititci, U. S. (2017). Interplay between performance measurement and management, employee engagement and performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 37(9), 1207-1228.
- Snyder, H. N., ve Sickmund, M. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- Spears, L. C. (2010b). *Servant Leadership and Robert K. Greenleaf's Legacy*. *Servant Leadership içinde* (11–24). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spitzer, D. R. (2007). *Transforming performance measurement: rethinking the way we measure and drive organizational success*. American Management Association.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership. *Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 35-71.
- Suheyb F. G. (2024). *Servant Leadership, Employee Resilience, and Workplace Bullying: An Investigation in Somalia Contexts [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]*. Ankara Yildirim Beyazıt University.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- Tannenbaum, W., ve Weschler, I. Massarik. (1961). *Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Approach*.
- TAPINOS, E., Dyson, R., Medow, S. (2005). The Impact of Performance Measurement in Strategic planning. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 54(5).
- Thangavelu, A., ve Sudhahar, C. (2017). Role Clarity and Job Performance among the Employees in Small and Medium IT Industries. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(17), 6–10.
- Thompson and Vecchio (2009). Testing three different versions of Situational Leadership Theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), 837-848.
- Tubre, T., Arthur, W. J., ve Bennett, W. J. (2006). General models of job performance: Theory and practice. W. Jr. Bennett, C. E. Lance, ve D. J. Woehr (Ed.), *Performance measurement: Current perspectives and future challenges içinde* (175-203). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Turner, M. D. (1999). Conflict, environmental change, and social institutions in dryland Africa: Limitations of the community resource management approach. *Society & Natural Resources*, 12(7), 643-657.
- TUYGLEN F. (1998). *Organizational Process and organizations Effectiveness*.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1228-1261.
- Van Scotter, J., Motowidlo, S. J., ve Cross, T. C. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 526–535.
- Vecchio, R. P. (2000). Negative emotion in the workplace: Employee jealousy and envy. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7(3), 161-179.
- Venkatraman, N., ve Ramanujam, V. (1986). Measurement of business performance in strategy research: a comparison of approaches. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 801-814.
- Verweire, K., ve Van den Berghe, L. (2004). *Integrated performance management: a guide to strategy implementation*. Sage Publication.
- Viswesvaran, C. (2002). Assessment of individual job performance: A review of the past century and a look ahead. N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, ve C. Viswesvaran (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational*

- psychology, Volume 1: Personnel psychology içinde (110-126). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Viswesvaran, C., ve Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4), 216-226.
- Von Glinow, M., ve McShane, S. (2000). Organizational behavior.
- Vroom, V. H., ve Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 17.
- Waldman, D. A. (1994). The contributions of total quality management to a theory of work performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 19(3), 510-536.
- Wang, H., Sui, Y., Luthans, F., Wang, D., ve Wu, Y. (2014). Impact of authentic leadership on performance: Role of followers' positive psychological capital and relational processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1), 5-21.
- Weber, M. (1968). The types of legitimate domination. G. Roth ve C. Wittich (Ed.), *Economy and society* (3. Cilt) içinde (212-216). Bedminster.
- Websites/Other (without specific article/book structure):
- Wen, T., Theresa, C., Kelana, B., Othman, R., ve Syed, O. (2019). Leadership Styles in Influencing Employees' Job Performances. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*.
- West, S. G., Finch, J. F., ve Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* içinde (56-75). SAGE Publications.
- Wheel Wright, S. C. (1984). Manufacturing strategy: defining the missing link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(1), 77-91.
- Wilson, N. C., ve Stokes, D. (2005). Managing creativity and innovation: The challenge for cultural entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*.
- Wilson-Starks, K. Y. (2003). Toxic leadership. *Transleadership, Inc*, 1, 2016.
- Wu SP-J, Straub DW, Liang T-P. (2015). How information technology governance mechanisms and strategic alignment influence organizational performance: insights from a matched survey of business and it managers. *MIS Quarterly*, 39(2), 497-518. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2015/39.2.10>
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organization* (7. Baskı). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Yukl, G., Mahsud, R., Hassan, S., ve Prussia, G. E. (2013). An improved measure of ethical leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(1), 38-48.
- Yukl, G., ve Gardner, W. L. (2020). *Leadership in organizations* (9. Baskı). Pearson.
- Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., Zhang, L., Xu, S., Liu, X., ve Chen, W. (2019). A meta-analytic review of the consequences of servant leadership: The moderating roles of cultural factors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 38, 371-400.
- Zhu, W., Chew, I.K.H., ve Spangler, W.D. (2005). CEO transformational leadership & organizational outcomes: The mediating role of human-capital-enhancing human resource management. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(1), 39-52.

ANNEXURE 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent

I am Aso Ali Mohammed, MBA student in Türkiye. This survey aims to collect empirical data and information for a research project entitled (THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE: ANALYTICAL STUDY ON BUSINESS COMPANIES EMPLOYERS IN NORTHERN IRAQ).

We really appreciate your participation in the survey, as the questions are based on your information. To indicate how well you understand the answer to the following sentences, please put a tick (✓) in the appropriate place: But all answers will be kept confidential and used for scientific purposes only;

The names of the participants will not be revealed. Thanks in advance for your time.

Researcher: Aso Ali Mohammed

Thank you.

Yours faithfully

Do you agree to participate in this research voluntarily and without any pressure or coercion?

- a. YES
- b. NO

Section 1: LEADERSHIP STYLES (Servant and Toxic leadership)

a. Toxic Leadership Behavior scale

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Neutral	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

	ITEMS (My Leader)	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Humiliates others						
2.	Uses sarcastic remarks						
3.	Takes “potshots” at others in public						
4.	Distrusts opinions of others						
5.	Monitors team behaviors to the point of surveillance						
6.	Meddles in teamwork						
7.	Uses authority to punish others						
8.	Demonstrates passive-aggressive behaviors						
9.	Protects one’s own territory						
10.	Has difficulty accepting negative feedback						
11.	Is clueless that they are toxic to others						
12.	Points out the mistakes of others						

b. Servant Leadership Behavior Scale

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Partially	Neutral	Partially	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Agree

	ITEMS (My Leader)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Uses power in service to others, not for his or her ambition							
2.	Gives me the right to question his or her actions and decisions							
3.	Respects me for who I am, not how I make him or her feel							
4.	Enhances my capacity for moral actions							
5.	Helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work							
6.	Contributes to my personal and professional growth							

Section 2: Individual Performance

In the past 3 months . . .

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly	Disagree	Partially	Neutral	Partially	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Agree

	ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time.							
2.	My planning was optimal							
3.	I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work.							
4.	I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work.							
5.	I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort.							

Section 3: Demographic Profile of Respondents

1. What is your gender? Male (☐), female(☐).
2. What is your age group?, 18-25 (☐) 26-35 (☐) 36-45 (☐) 46-55(☐) 56- and Above(☐)
- 3- Academic Qualification: Diploma (☐), Bachelor (☐), Professional (☐), Master (☐), PhD (☐)
- 4-Professional Experience: 5 and below (☐) 6-10 (☐) 11-15 (☐)16-20 (☐)21 and Above (☐)
- 5- Job: Manager (☐), Supervisor (☐), Technician (☐), Trainers (☐), Employee (☐).

ANNEXURE 2: ETİK KURULU KARARLARI

	T.C. TOKAT GAZİOSMANPAŞA ÜNİVERSİTESİ SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER ARAŞTIRMALARI ETİK KURULU KARARLARI	Doküman No	TOGÜ.FRM.185
		İlk Yayın Tarihi	02.08.2024
		Revizyon Tarihi	20.01.2025
		Revizyon No	01
		Sayfa No	1/1

Birim Adı	Genel Sekreterlik
Kurul/ Komisyon Adı	TOGÜ Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu

Toplantı Tarihi	Oturum No	Karar No
25.04.2025	07	01-68

Üniversitemiz Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başkanı Prof. Dr. Tuğba KILIÇER Başkanlığında toplandı.

KARAR 07.24- Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğünün 11.04.2025 tarih ve 559835 sayılı yazısı görüşüldü.

Aşağıda bilgileri yer alan araştırmacıların yapmak istediği uygulamaların ve kullanacağı veri toplama araçlarının etik açıdan uygunluğuna oy birliği ile karar verildi.

ÇALIŞMANIN TÜRÜ	Yüksek Lisans Tezi
BAŞLIK	Liderlik Stilllerinin Örgütsel Performans Üzerindeki Etkileri: Kuzey Irak'taki İşletme Şirketleri İşverenleri Üzerinde Analitik Bir Çalışma
TEZ YÜRÜTÜCÜSÜ/ YAZARI	Doç. Dr. Musa Said DÖVEN Aso Ali Mohammed (İşletme Anabilim Dalı)
RAPORTÖR GÖRÜŞÜ	OLUMLU

Prof. Dr. Tuğba KILIÇER
Etik Kurul Başkanı
(İmza)

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Serkan UMUZDAŞ
Başkan Yardımcısı
(İmza)

Prof. Dr. Emine ÖĞÜK
Üye
(İmza)

Prof. Dr. Mehmet KARGÜN
Üye
(İmza)

Doç. Dr. Elif BOYRAZ
Üye
(İmza)

Doç. Dr. Ümran ÇEVİK GÜNER
Üye
(İmza)

Doç. Dr. Hüseyin Baha ÖZTUNÇ
Üye
(İmza)