Machiavellianism, Transactional Leadership Style and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture among Government Employees

By

Aneela

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

Center of Excellence

QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY

ISLAMABAD, PAKISTAN

2021

Machiavellianism, Transactional Leadership Style and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture among Government Employees

By

Aneela

A Research Report submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the Degree of Master of Science in Psychology

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

Center of Excellence

Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad

2021

Machiavellianism, Transactional Leadership Style and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture among Government Employees

By

Aneela

Approved by

_____

(Dr. Syed M. Imran Bukhari)

Supervisor

_____

(Prof. Dr. RubinaHanif)

Director NIP

_____

(External Examiner)

Certificate

This is to certify that M.Sc. research report on**Machiavellianism, Transactional Leadership Style and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture among Government Employees** prepared by Aneelahas been approved for submission to Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

_____

Dr. Syed M. Imran Bukhari

Supervisor

Machiavellianism, Transactional Leadership Style and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture among Government Employees

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Method

Chapter 3: Results

Chapter 4: Discussion

Dedicated To My Abu Jan, Ami Jan

&

My Beloved Siblings

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Acknowledgement

In the name of Allah almighty, the most merciful and the most beneficent

First of all I am thankful to Allah, who is the kindest, merciful and beneficial, who has bestowed me for better than I deserved and helped me at each phase of life and showed me the right path. Who has given me the courage, insight and knowledge to accomplish this research.

Secondly, through only my name appears on the cover of this research report, a great many people have contributed to its production. I owe my gratitude to all of those people who have made this research possible and because of whom my graduate experience has been one that I will cherish forever. My deepest gratitude is to my supervisor **Dr. Syed Imran Bukhari** for imparting essential knowledge, guidance and constant support to bring out the quality work.

Thirdly, I would like to pay special gratitude to my best and close friends for their positive and helping attitude in the entire journey for theirsupport, help motivation throughout straggle. I gently value their friendship and I deeply appreciate their belief in me.

Lastly, Most importantly, none of this would have been possible without the love and patience of my family.My special gratitude to my father **Muhammad Sarfraz**, my mother **Toheed Fatima**and my brother **Adeel Hassan**for their love, support and encouragement help throughout my life and overcoming many difficulties during the accomplishment of my research. And special to thanks to all Ministry departments' employees who participate in the research.

Aneela

Abstract

The aim of conducting the present study was to identify the relationship between Machiavellianism, transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. The sample comprised of N= 200 and the sample was taken from different ministry organizations of Rawalpindi and Islamabad, thus including (*n*= 149) male and (*n*= 51) female employees in the study. The age range of the sample from 22-58 years with a (M = 36.51 & SD=7.94). In order to measureMachiavellianism-IV scale will be used to assess Machiavellianism developed by Christie and Geis(1970),Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is the gold standard for assessing transactional leadership styleby Avolio and Bass(1995), and the organizational culture index (OCI) use to measure bureaucratic organizational culture developed by Wallach (1983). The results of the study showed that Machiavellianism has significant positive relationship with transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees. The relationship of research variables were also studied with the demographic variables of the government employees. Through independent sample t-test gender differences, job designations analysis revealed that the significant differences on Machiavellianism, transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees. Through ANONA analyze the difference on education and monthly income results show that higher the education and monthly income higher will be theMachiavellianism, transactional leadership style and organization were bureaucratic in nature. The findings of this study demonstrate the critical necessity of transactional leadership in the organizations. After analyzing the data, it is recommended that for routine task organization would adopt transactional style of leadership and used when there is complexity in job and interrelated tasks. The limitation and implications of the study were illustrated as well in the study.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Theaim of the present study are to explore one of the personality traitMachiavellianism with Transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees.This study will also explore the relationship with the demographic variables such as, gender, age, education, job designations in organization, job experience and monthlyincome among government employees.

Machiavellianism is a personality trait defined by personal manipulation and linked to specific emotional and social understanding skills patterns. Machiavellianism is a personality trait characterized by deception, brutality, and a disregard for morals. Employees with a high Machiavellianism score are more likely to be passionate and skilled at lying, and less likely to give honest answers during recruitment. Individuals with a high level of Machiavellianism are more prone than psychopaths or narcissists to employ deceit in interviews, and they are also more likely to consider lying in interviews as fair. To fulfill their own needs, Machiavelli (2011) advises leaders to lie, manipulate, and utilize powerful persuasion. Employees who score high on Machiavellianism aren't always in positions of formal power, but they do engage in actions that help them feel better about themselves. They are excellent in impression management tactics and have a natural flair for persuading others, all with the goal of increasing their own influence. Machiavellians have no regard for moral or ethical standards. They priorities on money, power, and competitiveness over social action, self-care, and family obligations and they strive to win at any costs (Spielberger& Butcher, 2013). Machiavellians use charm, deception, compulsion, and can be abusive in the job (Calhoon, 1969).

Adopting the suitable leadership style is critical to the organization's success. In this instance, transactional leadership becomes inapplicable because examining, praising, and evaluating a leader does not genuinely insure the followers' honesty (Parry & Thomson, 2002). Because transaction literally means to exchange, transactional leadership is concerned with the exchange of information between the leader and his or her followers. According to Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) transactional leadership is defined as an exchange between followers and leaders that achieves the

leader's and followers' intended results by meeting the leader's and followers' expectations through promises or duties based on respect and trust.Transactional leadership style is associated with the interactions that take place between leaders and employees(Bass 1985; Burns, 1978). These interactions enable leaders to achieve their routine objectives, complete required tasks, maintain the current organizational situation, motivate followers through contractual agreements, direct followers' behavior toward achievement of established goals, emphasize extrinsic rewards, avoid unnecessary risks, and focus on improving organizational efficiency. As a result, transactional leadership empowers followers to pursue their own goals, eliminate workplace anxiety, and focus on defined company goals like improved quality, customer service, cost reduction, and enhanced output (Sadeghi&Pihie, 2012).

Schein (2010)definesOrganizational culture is a set of shared basic assumptions that a group learns as it solves problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have proven to be valid enough to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel about those problems. Organizational culture is critical to an organizations success as well as the effective and efficient working of its teams. The use of established channels and processes to process information through multiple organizational divisions will be emphasized in a bureaucratic culture. While this appears to be harmless, it becomes troublesome and insufficient when dealing with problems or crises that the organization faces, i.e. rule-oriented. A bureaucratic organization is one that has a command structure that is pyramidal in nature. The bureaucratic organization is well-organized and functions with a high level of formality. Every department has its own organizational chart, and decisions are made in a systematic manner. At all times, a strong command and control system is in place. Bureaucracies are supposed to be well-organized, fair, and efficient (Westrum, 2004).

Working within a bureaucratic organizational culture needs a transactional leadership style. Machiavellianism traits also more relate to work within transactional leadership style. Only via the use of leadership styles is it possible to attain corporate objectives. In companies, transactional leadership involves managers and subordinates exchanging information. The exchange of rewards and targets between employees and management is referred to as transactional leadership Bass and Avolio (2000) explained the situation. Transactional leaders employ contingent rewards, corrective

measures, and rule enforcement to encourage their subordinates. Bureaucratic management is a type of management that is based on fixed official responsibilities and adherence to a set of norms.

Machiavellianism

In psychology, Machiavellianism is a personality trait in which a person is so intent on achieving his or her own goals that he or she would deceive, lie, and exploit others to do so. Machiavellianism is one of the Dark Triad's with characteristics, along with narcissism and psychopathy. A Machiavellian's interpersonal approach is deceitful. He or she lacks empathy and has a cynical attitude toward morals. The individual is only concerned with his or her own personal benefit and self-interest. They were given this name because people with these characteristics have a tendency to be callous, greedy, and spiteful in their interpersonal interactions (John &Paulhus, 2002).

Background

Machiavellianism is a set of views derived from Machiavelli's Prince, a treatise dedicated to Medici in 1513, and based on the opinions advocated to administrators in that work. In his work titled 'The Prince' Machiavelli suspiciously viewed persons as untrustworthy, selfish, pathetic, and cruel, and as a result, he counseled supervisors to deliberately employ cunning, deception, obsequiousness, and other unfair means to attain their objectives (Becker & Hair, 2007).The following is a summary of Machiavelli's instructions to administrators in his work titled "The Prince" (Machiavelli, 2011). He advised that individuals should always follow in the footsteps of great people and mimic the perfect. He stated that a person who strives to be a good human being will undoubtedly be destroyed by all others who are not good. He stated that someone who wishes to maintain their position should learn not to be respectable and would utilize or not use this representative depending on the situation.Individuals are unappreciative, impulsive, deceitful, and cheaters by nature, they lane risk and seek profit. He advised that individuals who did not care to keep their commitments and who used deception to deter people finally triumphed over those who had accomplished excessive things and were ultimately founded on morality. People should know how to use both animals and humans well, he said. Because people are bad and don't keep their promises, you don't have to keep yours.

People should also make good use of their lion and fox covers, they must be clever to mimic the nature of these two creatures. He also noted that he should create the sense of exceptional wisdom and greatness in all of his actions.

Machiavelli's ideas also influenced a managerial paradigm that is still debated and remarked upon today (Kara, 2009). According to this viewpoint, the administrator must persuade the governed that persons are religious, factual, honest, loyal, kind-hearted, fair, and unbiased. The circumstance that the management operates in this manner resolve equally legitimize any means he employs to accomplish his or her objectives and will inhibit the administrator's tactics from being attacked by the governed once the objectives have been met.In terms of morality, Machiavelli's opinions were heavily attacked. As a result, church leaders labeled the novel Prince by means of the product of the evil spirit. In fact, Machiavelli's thoughts are now encapsulated in the term of "Machiavellianism," which refers to the certainty that being cruel or immoral is further effective than being moral in achieving goals, despite the fact that Machiavelli is concerned with the governmental consequences of good or immoral behavior rather than the emergence of moral or immoral behaviors in terms of organizational activities (Guney&Mandac, 2009).Machiavellianism as immoral personality qualities, including inclinations to maximize personal interests and to use and through other individuals as tools to accomplish their objectives (Ayan, 2017;Czibor, 2017 &Demirtas, 2014). Machiavellianism, according to Markova (1987), is the employment of a position, spirits, and information in order to shape further individuals in the manipulator's preferred way. In contrast to cooperation, a manipulator will profit from worked others instruction to attain his or her objectives (Dawkins & Krebs, 1978; Wilson, 1998).

Persons with Machiavellian personality qualities frequently display flexibility and peripheral controller personality traits, which are crucial parts of interactive strategies for maximizing one's own interests while interacting with others (Czibor, 2017). They have distrust for the individuals with whom they interact, a drive for power, a desire for a dominant position, and the ability to cheat by performing deceitfully (Christie &Geis, 1970; Dahling, 2009).People with greater levels of Machiavellianism self-doubt tend to make others apprehensive because their suspicion of others encourages them to take advantage of others. They handle people by performing first rather than waiting towards be manipulated because they fear

others will try to manipulate them (Baum, 2017). The people have insecure views, can hide their feelings, maintain a safe distance from others, are cynical, pragmatic, do not think morally, develop continuing strategic plans, action on the basis of deceptions and exploitation, and are effective in influencing others and resolving social difficulties (Ayan, 2017). Machiavellian principles and authoritarian personality traits have also been linked (Kara, 2009). Although Machiavellians keep a safe distance from others, they exhibit personality qualities that suggest they have the ability to convince others in the direction of their own interests in order to exploit them.

Christie and Geis (1970) defined Machiavellianism as the persons who can be hostile and compulsive to achieve their objectives, are much fewer concerned about the spirits and well-being of others, who are fascinating, confident and peaceful, at the same time pleased, anxious toward others, and have a proclivity to impact and feat others, People with lower levels of Machiavellianism. On the other hand, are kind, submissive, and socially inept persons who are fewer prone to influence or control others in their own interests, but who are anxious about others' interests, According to (Baum, 2017) employees who have high levels of Machiavellianism are more likely to be involved in socially harmful behavioral patterns that can increase their wellbeing by preventing their coworkers' achievements, exploiting others' feelings of inadequacy because they have a claim to designation and control, and attempting to manage special permission. Employees with greater levels of Machiavellianism, for example, may develop behaviors that villainies colleague's work or release false facts about the job in order to put coworkers in a detrimental position.

When compared to individuals with lower degrees of Machiavellianism, Employees with higher levels of Machiavellianism are more likely to direct others, earn more, be less convinced and persuaded by others, dislike their work less, feel more pressurized by their jobs, and engage in odd behaviors (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Machiavellianism are perceived as the leadership styles that are not in line with moral principles among the various types of leadership (Brown & Trevino, 2006). When a person commits fraud and prioritizes his or her own interests over the organization and subordinates, he or she will not be productive when his or her subordinates are led at the idea of moral values and organizational aims (Kwak& Shim, 2017). Nonetheless, Machiavellian in organizations are likely to succeed in occupations that involve negotiation abilities, and huge awards are awarded for

captivating (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Machiavellian leaders able to be beneficial for firms because they are particularly good at devising competitive strategies that focus on winning in a reasonable manner in situations where negotiation and persuasion are not possible.Machiavellian leaders can be beneficial to firms because they are highly good at developing competitive strategies that focus on winning in a coherent way in situations somewhere negotiation and influencing abilities are required (Christie &Geis, 1970). Machiavellianism is a psychological trait that discussesa social action strategy that requires manipulating others for personal achievement, typically at the expense of others self-absorption (Christie &Geis, 1970; Jones &Paulhus, 2009).Individuals with a higher Mach are defined by a set of qualities that can be stated as (a) a strong goal motivation and (b) inclination to use any available methods to attain their objectives. High-Mach had a more goal-oriented mindset and places a high value on success and winning (Jones &Paulhus, 2009).

High-Mach's, are emotionally isolated from their own acts, letting them to participate in immoral behavior lacking feeling guilty or remorse (McHoskey, 1998; Wastell& Booth, 2003). Machiavellians do not have the same access to the regulating social function of (self-conscious) negative emotions as individuals who are low on Mach (Bagozzi, 2013). Machiavellianism is associated with a strong sense of self-centeredness and self-importance (Fehr, 1992), which leads to a dearth of loyalty and obligation to others otherwise for the organizations (Zettler, 2007)

Machiavellian beliefs are an affective-cognitive domain that encompasses a gloomy and negative view of humanity as naive, untrustworthy, greedy, and manipulative. (Rauthmann, 2013) explains, those strong in Machiavellianism are prone to use this view of others as an impulse and justification to lie and exploit others when the opportunity arises. If a person believes that others will try to take advantage of them, one efficient way to prevent their efforts is to manipulate the situation ahead of time to serve their own personal goals(Christie &Geis, 1970). Furthermore, if someone with Machiavellian ideas exploits others who are equally unsympathetic, they are less likely to feel shame or guilt as a result i.e., avoiding empathy (McIlwain, 2011). Machiavellianism's ideas dimension is crucial, as it serves to drive and legitimize Machiavellian techniques.It seems reasonable to suppose that Machiavellians can effortlessly read others thoughts and comprehend social circumstances (Davies & Stone, 2003; Czibor&Bereczkei, 2012), which they can

effectively exploit in the facility of their own essential motives (Fehr, 1992; Jones &Paulhus, 2009). Anumeralquestion about Machiavellian talents and their determinants have been raised. Trainings have found a non-significant connection between this attribute and overall IQ, for example, this has been attributed to the distinctiveness of the methods involved in Machiavellianism relatively than to general abilities (i.e., total IQ) ([Wilson, 1996](); [Paulhus& Williams, 2002](); [Jones &Paulhus, 2009]()).

The most essential aspects in an organizations success are the interactive patterns that organizations exhibit as a result of individual and organizational qualities. At that stage, Machiavellian behavior tendencies include desire, to use and through other people as tools to exploit personal interests and achieve objectives, all means of reaching the goals as fair.Workers with a stronger Machiavellianism propensity demonstrate activities outside of the ethical norms outlined inside the traditional morality form. On the other hand, modern companies are attempting to keep a safe distance from immoral behavior in order to avoid being influenced by equally the conscious societal structure and potential authorized or economic damages (Gurer&Ciftci, 2018).

The Machiavellian personality. The following are some of the characteristics and indicators of a Machiavellianism personality by Jones and Paulhus (2009):

Individuals are only concerned with their own goals and ambitions. They appear to be self-assured and appealing. They will manipulate and exploit others in order to advance. They are usually unconcerned about the consequences of their conduct.They will lie, cheat, and deceive when it is necessary. Relationships are less important than power and money. They have a proclivity for flattery. There are no ideals or principles to speak about. They have a pessimistic attitude on morals and goodness. Empathy is either lacking or non-existent. They are capable of harming or inflicting harm to others in order to attain their objectives. They might be incredibly patient due to their calculating temperament. Machiavellianism makes it difficult for most people to recognize their own feelings. Some people are tough to get to know and appear distant.

The ABCDs of Machiavellianism

Although the Machiavellian ABCDs can be recognized, they are hardly, if summarised (Jones &Paulhus, 2009) and have yet to be grouped into a comprehensive and integrative Mach model or scale.

*1. Machiavellian affects.*Have shallow or cold affect, especially in interpersonal contexts which ties Machiavellian have emotional impact to subclinical psychopathy (Christie &Geis, 1970). Machiavellians appear to have less of a morality and express fewer guilt than other people, while their capacity to think through moral difficulties appears to be unaffected. They can see other people's points of view, but they nevertheless act selfishly (Jones &Paulhus,2009).Long-term deliberate planning necessitates that individuals delaytemporary emotions and needs, as well as controlling mechanisms which is an crucial characteristic when Machiavellians need to be cool and deliberate rather than hostile and imprudent (Jones &Paulhus, 2009).

*2. Machiavellian behaviors.*Manipulation and mistreatment of others for personal gain are characteristics (Christie &Geis, 1970; Jones &Paulhus, 2009). Machiavellians may utilize a variety of strategies to achieve their goals, including alliance and cooperation building, impression management and reputation building, situational adaptation and flexibility, deception, cheating, lying, retribution, and betrayal (Jones &Paulhus, 2009).

*3.Machiavellian cognitions.*Unconstructiveness against other individuals, social-consensual values and structures, and world in commoncharacterised (Christie &Geis, 1970). Several perceptional and thinkingfeatures are fundamental to Mach (Jones &Paulhus, 2009) and conservative thinking, including immoral attitudes and a low respect for morals, self-centeredness, enduring planning, and meticulous preparation of strategies, strategies, and plans.

*4. Machiavellian desires.*can be described as normallyagentic (Jones &Paulhus, 2009), Machiavellians exhibit cold self-centeredness and instrumentality in followingagentic goals like status, money, authority, and competitiveness (Stewart &

Stewart, 2006), but give communal goals like coordination, affection, and family a low priority (McHoskey, 1999).

Machiavellianism as a Multidimensional Construct

Machiavellianism(Christie &Geis, 1970) is seen to be a multifaceted construct with four distinct facets: (a) amoral manipulation, (b) suspicion of others, (c) desire for power, and (d) desire for position. These four dimensions, according to this viewpoint, constitute various but interconnected representations of the same overarching construct, with similar relationships to its antecedents and consequences.A major feature of Machiavelliansis based on the construct's initial definition, which placed at its core an approach characterized by an intentional predisposition toward manipulating and betraying others whenever the possibility to gain from such behavior is provided.

1. ***Amoral Manipulation.*** *It is characterized as a propensity to violate moral principles in favor of acts that profit one at the expense of others. Furthermore, Machiavellians have a pessimistic attitude toward others, intentionally attributing hostile intentions and motivations to others.*
2. ***Distrust of Others.*** *It is characterized as having a pessimistic attitude toward other people's motivations and intentions, as well as a concern for the negative consequences of those objectives for oneself.*
3. ***Desire for Control.****It is characterized as a desire to exert dominance in excess of interpersonal circumstances in order to reduce the authority of others.*
4. ***Desire for Status.***It is characterized as a desire to amass external success markers. The fourth feature to analyze is Machiavellians' purposes and ambitions, they emphasis external and extrinsic goals like position, power, and fortune while ignoring intrinsic and internal goals like individual and personal fulfillment.

Machiavellianism and Theory of Mind

The ability of power mental states to ourselves and others is recognized as theory of mind (ToM) and it is one of the most imperative aspects of social

collaboration. Having a theory of mind is advantageous since it allows you to predict and analyze other people activities. According to researchers, Machiavellians are very successful in a wide range of scenarios, from money games to work practices(Wilson, 1996). According to Nichols (2001) such achievement is based, at least in part, on abilities to see things from other people perspectives. Similarly, Machiavellians prosper because of their ability to read their interaction partners minds.Othersclaim that Machiavellians are oblivious to others plights, are selfish, and engage in emotional disengagement in relationships (Slaughter, Pritchard, & Gibbs, 2003). Machiavellianism, according to Paal and Bereczkei (2007) should be favorably associated with ToM skills. It's also been stated that Machiavellians are better at reading people minds. Furthermore, Machiavellians are typically distinguished by their detached demeanor and lack of emotional contact with others (Wrightsman, 1991).

Transactional Leadership Style

Leadership is seen to play a critical influence in improving the performance of followers, also known as employees in the workplace (Khan, Mughal&Khattak, 2017). Leadership is one of the furthest important interpreters of an organization achievement or failure. A leadership style is a mode in which how he or she leads and motivates others to attain organizational objectivesThe role of leadership in an organization is critical in terms of creating a vision, mission, determining and establishing objectives, designing strategies, guidelines, and methods to achieve organizational objectives effectively and efficiently, as well as directing and controlling efforts and organizational activities.(Xu& Wang, 2008). To achieve the determination and vision, as well as cope with fluctuations in the external environment, top-notch leadership is mandatory (Harris, 2007). Many productions are currently dealing with issues such as immoral tactics, significant employee income, poor economic performance, and so going on. It is probable that this is due to a dearth of proficient leadership. The term leadership stylebring up to a set of structures, traits, and behaviors that leaders pay when work together with their assistants. (Monga& Coetzee, 2012).

According to Monga and Coetzee (2012) leadership is anarrangement of managerial behavior that is aimed to integrate organizational or individual interests

and influences in order to achieve explicit goals. If a leader is continually willing to provide something in profit, he or she is pronouncedas a transactional leaders(Uchenwamgbe, 2013). Promotions, wage advances, recital reviews, and additional responsibilities are all illustrations of this style. The anticipation is the core issue with this nature of leadership. Transactional leadership can be defined as a management employee conversation of objectives and rewards (Ojokuku, 2012).

Background

Weber primarilypronounced the transactional leadership style in 1947, monitored by Bass in 1981. Leaders those who use this style the most it focuses on the controller, organization, and immediate planning procedures that are essential to organization. Weber (1947) initially established the concept of transactional leadership style in his exertion on socio-economic concerns of the institute. Weber(1947) characterize transactional leadership as a frontrunner who wins power over normative rules and procedures, severe restraint, and methodical controller.Transactional leadership style, according to Burns (1978) is added of a collaboration sort of association at work, where discussion is a primary form of contact between superior and inferior, such as financial rewards for meeting established goals. The obedience of followers was based not just on coherent principles and regulations, but also on predetermined settlements. Followers are both lead and constrained by the responsibilities that have been assigned to them. The organization bureaucracy and hierarchical order determine remuneration. As it relates to various situations and conditions, clearly demarcated coercive measures have previously been created.

According to Bass (1985) primarily focused on follower purpose and role definition, as well as how leaders rewarded or sanctioned follower behavior. Only basic exchanges with followers were induced by transactional leadership. To attain optimal levels of performance, Bass (1985) proposed that a model change was required to understand how leaders encourage employees to exceedself-centeredness for the better benefit of their components of organizations.A transactional leader defines and emphasizes goals and objectives, as well as required duties, performance, corporate rewards, and the consequences of laxity. The personal interests of subordinates are put aside by transactional leaders. It's a sort of leadership that more

of an exchange process, likeif you do really for me, I will give you this. Transactional leadership, often recognized as transactional organization, whichgive emphasis to supervision, organization, and routine. It is an indispensable component of the full-spectrum leadership model.Transactional leadership is a management style in which leaders utilize both rewards and penalties to motivate staff to follow orders. Transactional leaders can use a rewards and punishments system to keep people motivated in the short term. Those who employ the transactional method aren't necessarily attempting to shape the future. Transactional leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative to make contact with others with the intention of exchanging valued commodities(Burns, 1978).

Burns (1978) argues that Transactional leaders are aware of their employee's needs and assist them in completing their assigned responsibilities, allowing them to perform exceptionally well in the face of adversity. Transactional leaders, according to Bass and Avolio (1995) recognize employee needs and make provisions to address those requirements through rewards given to such employees for their hard work and contributions to the completion and performance of assigned duties.Employees under transactional leadership supposed that their superior's connection with them was dependent on the results of their work. Transactional leadership is anorganization style that guides and inspires people while also clearly defining the organization goals as well as the employees' roles and responsibilities (Bateman, 2002).

Dimensions of Transactional Leadership Style

On the leadership scale, transactional leadership are diametrically opposed (Burns,1978). Transactional leaderships are goal-oriented, and the leader can be successful if the leader and the followers are in agreement. According to Bass (1985) transactional leadership entails the formation of agreements between the leader and the follower. The transactional leader is focused about how they can assist the individuals who report to them. Transactional leadership, according to Kezer and Eckel (2008) delivers rewards based on performance Bass and Avolio, (2000) classified transactional leadership into three categories using the MLQ-5X (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire).

1. ***Contingent rewards***.   It is defined by Bass and Avolio (2000) as the trade-off

between performance and incentives. The leader has the power to motivate his or her subordinates. When followers meet the expectations of tasks assigned to them, they are rewarded. The reward, on the other hand, is not always a positive reinforcement (Northouse, 2010).Transactional leaders link the goal to the rewards, set mutually agreed-upon goals, and encourage effective performance with a variety of incentives. They set SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goals for their subordinates. The interaction and transactional efficacy between superiors and subordinates is depicted in this diagram. Transactional leaders who adopt this aspect will be willing to provide any aid in discussion for the efforts of their subordinates, and they resolve content only when their potentials were met. For the achievement of desired goals, rewards or incentives are applied.

2. *Active management by exception.* Transactional leaders monitor their employees work closely, looking for deviations from rules and standards and develop appropriate action to avoid mistakes.The idea of being active or passive might be used to elucidate on this. The leader's active role includes monitoring the efforts of the followers or workers and noting any errors. When necessary, the leader takes immediate action. To improve motivation for duties, the leader frequently reminds the employees of their contracts.

3. *Passive management by exception.* Transactional leaders only intervene when criteria are not met or performance falls short of expectations. Punishment may be used as a kind of retaliation for poor performance.Transactional leaders place a high value on work standards, task assignments, and so forth (Northouse, 2010). Leaders prefer to motivate their followers to complete tasks by setting clear goals and providing clear directions.

McGregor Theory X

McGregor's(1960) Theory X is related to Transactional Leadership in that it requires leaders to exert control over others through fear and consequences. Employees are motivated by incentives, and negative behavior is punished in this style and ideology. Because both theory and style support the idea that managers want to promote their workers. Leaders expect their employees to do their best. They think of them as dependable, courteous, and self-motivated. Leaders play a role in

equipping individuals with the resources they need to succeed (Odumeru&Ogbonna, 2013).

The transactional leadership style theoretical examination is constructed on McGregor Theory X. McGregor remained the university first permanent psychology professor. In his book Human Side of Enterprise, published in 1960, he recognized and created the famed Theory X. The theory X is a human motivation theory that has been utilized in human resource organization. It describes two very distinct views toward employee inspiration and is based on Maslow' hierarchy of needs.McGregor's(1960) Theory X explained that workers should be continuallyobserved and directed on mandatory tasks, that organization should force and control employees, and that the middling worker dislikes work and wants to escapeduties at all costs. It also assumes that work presentation is motivated by currency, place, or punishment. Theory X thinks that restrictions should be adopted to ensure conformity, that the average person lacks determination, aversions responsibility, and prefers to be a supporter rather than a lead, that people oppose adjustment, and that they are selfish. Theory of X is similar to transactional leadership, which has a gloomy perspective of the character of employees in the workplace.

When leaders approach followers with the intention of exchanging something for something else, this is known as transactional leadership. Transactions make up the majority of the connections between leaders and followers (Burns, 1978). The transactions and exchanges that take place between leaders, coworkers, and followers are emphasized in transactional leadership. To obtain their followers' compliance, transactional leaders believe in using traditional reward and punishment tactics.Extrinsic motivators (rewards and penalties) are used to gain workers' commitment, but only a small percentage of them comply. Transactional leaders are dictatorial, domineering, and action-oriented, with little regard for the influence they have on their followers. Transactional leadership is ineffectual in delivering change because of its conforming character, which accepts the existing organization's goals, structures, and cultures. Transactional leadership, which has been widely linked with the military, may be necessary in some situations. This type of leadership prioritizes results and hard labor at all costs.Theory X has altered the core assumptions of leaders who use this leadership style.

Bass Transactional Leadership Theory

According to Bass (1985) transactional leaders lack the same leadership qualities as transformational leaders. They are incapable of forming deep expressive bonds with their groups or motivating them to do additional than they previously considered possible. Transactional leaders remained considered to beinspire followers by set goals and talented incentives for anticipated performance rather than set goals and offering rewards for preferred performance.

The definition of Bass (1985) has changed dramatically over time. Transactional leadership is defined as leadership that is effective in achieving estimated or expected outcomes, in which leader recognizes and clarifies not only the role of the follower in achieving the leader's desired outcomes, but also what the followers need and how personsrequirements will be met in interchange for the followers acceptable effort and performance (Bass, 1985).As a result transactional leadership, assistantsacquire what they need to do to receive rewarded and escape punishment through an exchange procedure with their superior (Avolio & Bass, 1995). A transactional leader, without a doubt, meets the psychological and material needs of his or her followers, but a transformational leader goes above and beyond by awakening and elevating ostensibly higher desires and fostering personal growth.

Bass (1985) a disciple of Burns(1985) emphasizes transactional leadership are the best leadership. Transformational leadership claims that transactional leadership is ineffective. It is not intended to be a replacement for transactional leadership. Transaction endures to be a successful and compulsory instrument for leaders at all ranks. When transformational leaders seek to improvement consensus by interesting to the values of their groups or peers, transactional leadership may be used.When transformative leaders see him or her in alose-lose situation, they endeavor to turn it into a win-win condition. If this isn't probable, he or she be able to show that he or she has the transactional skills that a skilled negotiator needs (Waldman, 1990).

Full-range Transactional Leadership Theory

Bass and Avolio (1995) established the full-range leadership model, which has developed one of the most extensively utilizedmodels in today's study on

employee'sperceptions of leadership, based on Burns (1978) effort on leadership (Bass, Waldman, Avolio, &Bebb, 1987). Transactional leadership tries to encourage followers by assisting them in achieving their own self-centeredness, in addition to Burns,(1978) belief that leaders can be either transformational or transactional (Sadeghi&Pihie, 2012). Leaders offer incentives and punishments in interchange for meeting pre-determined enactment targets (Jung &Sosik, 2002; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).Leaders and followers have an unspoken agreement to mutually reinforce each other in order to attain higher recital (Jung &Sosik, 2002). Contingent incentive and active management-by-exception are the fundamental characteristics of transactional leadership (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bono & Judge, 2004; Stewart, 2006). The point to which followers are paid (e.g., incomes or status) in exchange for satisfying set performance goals is referred to as contingent reward (Bass, 1987; Bono & Judge, 2004). The active management-by-exception leader keeps a close eye on follower behavior for errors and rule infractions, and corrects them before they become serious (Sadeghi&Pihie, 2012).

Self-Determination Theory

The employee has been portrayed as a calculated individual who is motivated by a desire to pursue desirable outcomes while avoiding unfavorable outcomes in the motivation theories we've looked at. Hedonic theories of motivation are those that place an emphasis on desires, reasoning processes, and interactive repercussions in order to allow an individual to exploit pleasure while avoiding suffering (Ryan &Deci, 2001). Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is an organismic concept that has had a lot of influence in fields other than organizational psychology, but it has just lately been applied to employee motivation (Sheldon, 2003).SDT is essentially a set of smaller theories, according to Sheldon (2003) that all put emphasis on the relevance of persons executing tasks out of essential motivation or anintellect that duty performance is connected to significant components of an individual personality. Deci (1975) first stressed the relevance of fundamental motivation for task pleasure and persistence, when an employee's pursues a work because it is intrinsically enjoyable rather than for extrinsic reasons like attractive others or generating money.For example, two distinct employees may receive a bonus for achieving a specified level of performance. Some employees may see the bonus as an attempt by

management to rein in their behavior, while others may see it as praise for a job well done. The latter employee is more likely to feel more independent at work, resulting in more job perseverance and enjoyment.

Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) Model

The Vertical Dyad Linkage Model of leadership was established by Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975). Vertical Dyad was coined to define this concept because of its emphasis on the unique connection between leaders and subordinates. However, but this is primarily a social trading connection between the leader and the subordinate,the theory's name was later changed to Leader–Member Exchange. According to Dansereau(1975) there are normally two types of employees in work groups: in-group and out-group.An assessment of employees' views of how much their leader loves or hates other employees in comparison to the employees themselves is another fascinating discovery in the LMX dynamics. Employees believe that a coworker has a better relationship with their boss than they do, according to Tse, Lam, Lawrence, and Huang (2013). The features of the employee, the leader, and the connection between the employee and the leader were all linked to greater levels of LMX, according to these researchers.For example, increased LMX was linked to high levels of employee competence and positive affectivity, as well as low levels of negative affectivity. Employee feedback on leaders' willingness to compensate employees based on their performance and transformational leadership abilities. A transactional leader ensures that subordinates complete their tasks and obey the organization rules. To markvibrant the behaviors that are estimated of the employee, transactional leaders generally use behavioral principles of reward and punishment (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).Contingent reward (Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011) is another term for transactional leader behaviors, which refers to the behavioral strategy adopted by these leaders. Transactional leaders do not inspire their subordinates or enable substantial organizational transformation.

Bureaucratic Organizational Culture

Organizational culture, according to Schein (2010) is distinct as a set of collective beliefs, ethics, and standards that impact how employees conceive, feel, and perform in the place of work. Organizational culture is critical toward attaining an organization planned objectives. In order to increase performance, organizational values, customs, and norms can be changed to change employee behavior and attitudes (Rosenthal &Masarech, 2003). The culture of an organization is a critical tool for gaining a competitive edge and improving performance.Organizations must rely on innovations to achieve, and sometimes maintain, their success in a dynamic environment. As anemerging country, Pakistan looks numerous obstacles, and slight research has been completed on the various forms of culture that influence employee routine. As a result, in instruction to improve efficacy and effective working of an organization, it is necessary to understand different organizational cultures such as bureaucratic, supporting, and innovative, as well as their impact on the in-role.According to Krefting and Frost (1985) an organization's culture can aid in the creation of competitive improvement by describing the bounds of reasonablebenefit. These limits can let people engage more easily and boundary information dealing out to specific stages.As a result, it is proposed that aorganization can forecast employee responses based on shared ethics, allowing them to avoid unfavorable outcomes (Ogbonna, 1993). Organizational capabilities that are equally outstanding and improperly imitable by participants lead to a competitive benefit that can be sustained (Reed &DeFillippi, 1990). Johnson(1992) claimed that a company's uniqueness enhances its strength by providing a competitive advantage.Organizational culture that is bureaucratic The formal organization with a command chain, power, division of labor written rules, and downward communication patterns, records, and impersonality is known as a hierarchy of authority, and bureaucratic is defined by an organization's structure.

Weber(1947) identified the following key elements of bureaucratic organizational culture: The structure and flow of communication in an organization are the first, features that Weber (1947) looked at.The formal hierarchy of assignments in these organizations is characterized by a downward flow of assignments, whereas the accountability flow is upward. There are different levels in the organizational system. The obligation is delegated to the lower level by the higher level, with the level above being held accountable for task completion. Second, a

bureaucratic organization is defined by means of a definite partition of labor in which each participant is allocated a specific responsibility to accomplish the organization's aim.

Third, bureaucratic organizations be located distinguished by their formally drafted rule reserve. The attempt to become more efficient in bureaucracy is reflected in this high-stress written method. The longer a bureaucracy exists and grows, the more written rules it produces. These principles apply to all potential conditions for some organizations. In a university department, for example, rules are established in the form of a handbook that is divided into sections for academics, students, administrators, and civil servants. If there is no written regulation covering it, it is allowed, is the general guiding premise of this rule.

Fourth, the former written communications and records characterize bureaucracy. Memoranda, emails, written reports of detailed job operations, and records retained as evidence, such as records of time, date, and receipt of memos, are examples of written communication. Workers devote a significant quantity of time mailing notes back and forth because of the nature of bureaucracy. For example, in an organization, a weekly or monthly instant report of all work completed, as well as the time spent doing the assignment, and in certain organizations, employee attendance is reviewed periodically. Annual data on training, initiatives, research, and service can be found in other reports. Written evaluations, publications, and service testimonies must be included with each report. The written reports are subsequently assessed by management in order to assess the employees' performance.

Fifth, one of the features of bureaucracy is impersonality, which means that these types of organizations place a greater focus on the organization's aims and office than on the individual who holds that office (e.g., individual is not the important). Employees are condemned for being treated as robots who work for the firm, with a replacement available at any time (employee). As a result, employees' loyalty would be to the workplace work rather than the people they would work for.For example, a vacant job (due to retirement, death, or any other cause) can readily be occupied by assigning someone else.

According to Weber(1947)enable bureaucracies to flourish and achieve their desired outcomes. For example, one of the bureaucratic postal service organizations in the United States had expanded to the point where statistics reveal that one out of every single 150 employed Americans workings for their postal service (Frank, 1990).The functioning of these organizations is not solely dependent on individuals, usually their heads; for example, if the head of an organization leaves (died, retired, or resigned) for any reason, the organization continues to operate rather than falling apart or becoming disorganized in its functioning.

The application of ethical ideals in organizations results in a healthy organizational structure that has favorable things on all organizational variables and objectives. The duty of leaders plays the most significant role in the formation of afitting climate in organizations.Leaders are responsible for aligning the organizational structure with moral standards and motivating the organization personnel to uphold those values. Ethical leaders must set an example for employees and encourage right behaviors inside the organization by showing actions that remain compatible with moral beliefs and shared codes of morals beliefs when executing these activities. Organizational behavior is the attitude that employees acquire toward their organizations, ensuring that employees behave in ways that are loyal to and in the best interests of the business, especially in the face of adversity.Organization has been shown to have a favorable impact on a variety of organizational characteristics and to improve employee performance (Cesario&Chambel, 2017; Lorber&Savic, 2014). According to this viewpoint, any method or approach to achieving the goal is appropriate (Ayan, 2017). By not operating in accordance with ethical norms, these individuals employ techniques that allow them to manipulate people and situations to their advantage (Becker & Hair, 2007).

Wallach (1983) Model

Organizational culture, according to Wallach (1983) is a composite of different qualities such as bureaucratic culture, inventive culture, and supporting culture. Using this cultural aspects framework The Organizational Culture Index (OCD) was developed by Wallach (1983) and it assesses the culture in three stereotypical categories. The confluence of these dimensions, according to him, gives flavor to an organization culture. According to Wallach (1983) bureaucratic culture is

ordered with clear outlines of authority and a highly compartmentalized organization. The structure of systematic procedures is responsible for the power and control aspect of these cultures.These cultures are typically thought to be more established, vigilant, mature, power-oriented, traditional, solid, synchronous, orderly, structured, ritualistic, and hierarchical. Bureaucracy is defined by an organization structure, line of power (formalorganization with a level of leadership, power, and task division), composed principles, and a falling pattern of communication, records, and general quality.

The characteristics of a bureaucratic society are as follows.

1. The work environment is divided into different levels and compartments.

2. A culture based on power is created.

3. Employees those are unimaginative.

A bureaucratic structure can provide a firm with a number of benefits, such as a clear internal hierarchy and a clear depiction of worker functions. Furthermore, a bureaucratic structure can impose significant limits on a company, particularly one that operates in an industry that requires flexibility and quick response. Bureaucratic groups, according to Weber (1990) have reasonable authority. The working of these organizations are founded taking place the lawful rules and regulations, which their leaders be aware of and obey in the contribution of reasonable reasons, values, and effectiveness. The consistency, disciplined, reasoned, and methodical determination of ideal means to given aims provided the validity of these laws, rules, and regulations. The bureaucratic act, according to Weber (1990) orients an organization toward issue resolving and also guides the decision-making process toward the goal of productivity, expectedness, and calculability.

Relationship betweenMachiavellianism, Transactional Leadership Style and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture

Employees that have a higher level of Machiavellianism have a greater impact on the organization. Employees with greater levels of Machiavellianism disturbed the

running businesses, according to research findings (Elias, 2015) and they inclined to giveaway at work more than other employees with having transactional leadership styles.

According to Baum (2017)persons with larger levels of Machiavellianism are more to be expected to engage in socially damaging actions and follow a transactional leadership style. Machiavellianism has a beneficial link with bureaucratic corporate culture, according to a study (Girodo& Michel1998).A study titled "Relationship between Machiavellianism, Organizational Culture, and Workplace Bullying" was done by Pilch and Turska (2015). The findings indicate that Machiavellianism and bureaucratic organizational culture have a positiverelationship.One of the studywas done by Saeed and Mughal (2019). The findings reveal that transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture have a positive link.

According to research conducted by Longe (2014) transactional leadership has a positiverelationship between bureaucratic organizationalcultures. By allowing employees to earn both tangible and intangible benefits, transactional leadership helps to create and maintain an environment in which organizational and human talents are maximized. This leadership style helps to create a performance-enhancing environment by articulating a persuasive vision that increases overall organizational performance. (Longe, 2014).Transactional leadership, according to study conducted by Sofi and Devanadhen, (2015) has direct impact on organizational culture. This leadership style does not inspire employees to be creative or innovative, and as a result, employees do not meet the organization goals.

Rationale of the Study

Machiavellianism a personality trait in organizations and it is an important factor for employees, with Machiavelliantrait may tend to rationalize use of fair or unfair means in order to achieve what they desirein organization settings. High Machiavellianism have found to be high achievers in different accomplishments of their lives like leadership, economic adaptable behavior, betrayal, robbery, and professional choices, as well as assisting behaviors, organizational trust, and effective behavior (Dahling, 2009). Organizations are also well directed to introduce organizational values and policies to communicate acceptable and desirable employee

behaviors. Developing reward systems that clearly reward ethical behavior and punish immoral behavior could further help in establishing such norms and values. For routine task organization adopt transactional leadership style and used when there is complexity in job and interrelated tasks.According to Krefting and Frost (1985) organizational culture can provide a competitive advantage by establishing the organization's boundaries in a way that encourages individual interaction and limits the scope of information processing to suitable levels. Studying how culture has been represented in organizational systems is one method to identify the relationship between bureaucratic culture and transactional leadership. Transactional leaders are prone to working within the confines and constraints of the current culture.Leadership played a major role in nurturing the appropriate organizational culture which helped to improve the implementation of specific government reforms. The most effective leaders foster, support, and sustain organizational cultures that facilitate the type of organization reform envisioned by reinventing government and the attendant increases in effectiveness and efficiency. Having Machiavellian personality trait under working with transactional leadership it would be provide a support and conduciveness with in organization and it also lead with in bureaucratic organizational culture. Therefore, here this study, Machiavellianism and transactional leadership style help us to understand how these variables influence government employee's ability to achieve their desired goals with in a bureaucratic organizational culture.

The main aim of taking the government employees sample is that,in past researches mostly the studies with bank employees and private sectors organizations and the difficulties that exist within bureaucratic organizational culture with respect to transactional leadership style are not widely discussed among government employees in Pakistan. So, Machiavellianism is needed to study with transactional leadership styleand bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees.Employees in the private sector placed a lower value on bureaucratic organizational culture, while government employees placed a higher value on transactional leadership styles which have more advantages associated with task accomplishment because leadership has alwaysconsidered key to success of an organizations.Therefore here is a need to understand leadership as a transactional and organizational culture as bureaucratic while using Machiavellian personality trait

within the employees, in order to enhance the effectiveness and successful working of organizations.

Chapter 2

Method

Objectives

1. To explore the relationship between Machiavellianism, Transactional Leadership, and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture among government employees.

2. The study also examines the relationship between various demographicsvariables such as gender, age, education, job designation in organization, job experience in organization and monthly income with the study variables.

Hypotheses

1. There will be a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and transactional leadership style among government employees.

2. There will be apositive relationship betweenMachiavellianism and bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees.

3. There will be a positive relationship between transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees.

Operational Definitions of Variables

The operational definitions that follow were created as follows:

Machiavellianism. Can be characterized as a personality trait that encompasses tendencies to maximize one's own personal interests and to use and direct other people as tools to achieve one's objectives (Ayan&Czibor, 2017). The Machiavellianism-IV scale (Christie &Geis, 2016) will be used to assess Machiavellianism. A high score on the Machiavellianism scale will indicate a higher level of Machiavellianism.

Transactional Leadership Style.A leadership style in which the leader uses both rewards and punishments to entice followers to obey orders.Transactional leaders can use a rewards and punishments system to keep followers motivated in the short term (Burns, 1978). The Transactional Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) will be used to assess transactional leadership style (Bass & Avolio, 2004). A high transactional leadership style score indicates a greater transactional leadership style level.

Bureaucratic Organizational Culture.A bureaucratic organizational culture is defined as the culture that is bound by rules, standardsand systematicprocedures for doing business (Weber, 1947). The Organizational Culture Index (OCI) will be used to assess bureaucratic organizational culture (Wallach, 1983). A high score on this measure indicates that the individual is bureaucratic in their organization.

Instruments

The following tools, as well as a demographic sheet, were used to gather data. The following is a description of the scale that was utilized in the study.

Machiavellianism - IV Scale (Christie &Geis, 1970). The Mach-IV was created by Christie and Geis (1970) to distinguish between people who prefer to agree and those who tend to disagree with Machiavellian ideas. The Mach-IV is a 20-item self-report measure of Machiavellianism that has been used in research to assess government employees. The scale has ten questions that support Machiavelli's point of view and ten questions that do not. As a result, the ten items in the scale were scorein reverse. Machiavellian behavior grows by means of the overall score on the scale rises.

The scale, which was produced through scoring, was used to answer the questions in the form of a 5-pointlikert scale. I strongly disagree = 1, I disagree

partially = 2, I am neutral = 3, I agree partially = 4, I strongly agree = 5.Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient of the scale is .79 in Christie and Geis original work from 1970. Individuals with higher levels of Machiavellianism are less concerned with the feelings and wellbeing of others, and are more aggressive and obsessive in their pursuit of their goals.People with lesser levels of Machiavellianism, are kind, submissive, and socially inept persons who remain less likely to manipulate or control others in their own welfares, nevertheless who care about the welfares of others.

Transactional Leadership Style. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is the gold standard for assessing transactional leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1995). It consistsof 36 measures that assess four different leadership styles: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. In this study, 12 transactional leadership style items are used. The items were scored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from (0) never to (4) often, if not constantly. It is divided into three subscales: (1) contingent reward (2) management-by-exception (3) Exceptional passive management.

Bureaucratic Organizational Culture. The study uses the Wallach (1983) Organizational Culture Index survey to examine organizational culture aspects. The organizational culture index (OCI) developed by Wallach (1983) describes organizational culture in three dimensions: Innovative, Bureaucratic and Supported. The instrument has 24 items, with 8 of them being employed in this study for bureaucratic organizational culture. The ranking is based on a four-point scale ranging from "does not describe my organization" (0) to "does not describe my organization most of the time" (3). Yahyagil (2004) discovered that the alpha reliability of the organizational culture index was .82 and that the sub-scale for bureaucratic scale was .86 (Chen, 2004).

Research design

The current study was a cross-sectional and correlational investigation into the association between Machiavellianism, Transactional leadership style, and Bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees.

Sample

A total of (*N*=200) government ministry employees were approached in data, both male and females. The sample age range from 22 to 58 years old, with an M = 36.51 and SD = 7.94.Job designation was categorized into two scales under 16(9, 11, 14, 15) and above 16 scale (16, 17, 18). Most of employees were under 16 scales because of circulating the Google form through references of employee's colleagues.Employees had a minimum of one year of experience and a maximum of thirty fouryears of experience with the M = 10.12 and SD = 6.99. The education levels ranged from F.A. to Ph.D. with monthly income start from below 50000 to above 150000 rupees.

Table 1

Demographics Profile of Sample (N =200)

Demographics	*f*	*%*
Gender		
Male	149	74.5
Female	51	25.5
Total	200	100
Education		
F.A	10	5
B.A	39	19.5
Masters& M.Phils.	127	63.5
Ph.D.& Others	24	12
Total	200	100
Job Designation		
Under 16 scale	106	53
Above 16 scale	94	47
Total	200	100
Monthly Income		
Below 50000	19	9.5
50000-100000	107	53.5

100000-150000	60	30
Above 150000	14	7
Total	200	100

The demographic profile of the participants in the current study is depicted in Table 1 Males (74.5%) and females (25.5%) made up the bulk of participants. The bulk of employees (63.5 %) had masters or M.Phil. The rest is divided into other categories.In terms of job designations, those with a scale of 16 or less were (53 %)) while those with a scale of 16 or more were (47%). In the monthly income, the majority of employees with incomes of 50,000 to 100,000 were (53.5%), those with incomes of below 50,000 were (9.5%), those with incomes of 100,000 to 150,000 were (30%), and those with incomes of above 150,000 were(7 %).

Procedure

The research was carried out in Pakistan twin cities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi.Data was collected via online and in-person methods from the different ministry departments. Formal approval of participants through signed informed consent was taken, and all participants were informed about the aim of the study.Employees were asked to answer the questionnaires after being fully educated on the study's goal and nature. It was insured that participants of the research could understand language. Participants were further informed that their information would be kept strictly confidential and utilized solely for the purposes of the study. Employees were instructed to respond honestly to each item and not to skip any. Questionnaire form booklet will be provided them by in persons and links of Google forms for online. Participants were appreciated for their assistance at the end. The data were analyzed for further findings.

Results

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between Machiavellianism, Transactional leadership, and Bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees ($N = 200$). Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to measure reliability. Descriptive statistics demonstrate the data's normalcy. The correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between variables and demographics. T-test and ANOVA were used to determine the mean difference.

Table 2

Alpha Reliability Coefficients and Descriptive Statistics of Machiavellianism, Transactional Leadership Style Questionnaire and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture scale (N =200)

Scales	N	α	M	S.D	Skew	Kurt	Range	
							Actual	Potential
Mach	20	.75	63.06	9.92	.20	-.17	37-83	20-100
BOC	8	.74	19.06	3.55	-.85	-.06	10-24	0-24
TLS	12	.69	30.83	6.28	-.29	-.62	15-44	0-48

*Note.*Mach = Machiavellianism, BOC = Bureaucratic Organizational Culture, TLS = Transactional leadership style

In Table 2the alpha reliability of the Machiavellianism Scale (Christie &Geis, 1970) Transactional Leadership Style Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2004) and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture (Wallach, 1983). All of thereliabilities are outstanding to good. Machiavellianism scale reliability is .75 which is a decent range. Transactional leadership style reliability is .74 which is within the acceptable range. The Bureaucratic organizational culture scale has reliability is .69 which is similarly good.The standard deviations show how far the responses differ from the mean of each variable. The skewness of all the sales is in the range of -1 to +1, indicating that the data is regularly distributed.

Table 3

Correlation Matrix of All the Study Variables for the Sample of Government Employees (N=200)

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Mach	-					
2	BOC	.20**	-				
3	TLS	.51**	.41**	-			
4	CR	.19**	.34**	.71**	-		
5	AME	.26**	.35**	.68**	.43**	-	
6	PME	.58**	.23**	.75**	.22**	.22**	-

Note. Mach = Machiavellianism, BOC = Bureaucratic Organizational Culture,TLS = Transactional Leadership Style, CR =Contingent Reward, AME = Active Management- by- Exception, PME = Passive Management- by- Exception **p<.01

Table 3 shows the inter correlation of all variables, which can be used to assess the direction and intensity of relationships across all variables in the study. The findings show that Machiavellianism is strongly linked to bureaucratic organizational culture. Transactional leadership style and also with their subscales; Contingent Reward, Active Management-by-Exception, and Passive Management-by-Exception all have strong positive correlations with Machiavellianism.Correlation between Bureaucratic Organizational Culture with Transactional leadership style and subscales Contingent Reward, Active Management- by- Exception and Passive Management-by- Exception is significant positive correlate with each other.All of the study hypotheses have been accepted.

Comparison of Demographic Features on Study Variables

Based on the demographics of the ministry government employees, mean differences were calculated across several groupings of samples. Gender (males and females), educational level (F.A., B.A., Masters & M.Phil. and Ph.D., and others), job designations (under16 scale and above 16 scale), and monthly income were used to establish the groupings (Below 50000, 50000-100000, 100000-150000, above

150000) in rupees. Independent sample t-tests are used to study demographics with two groups, and ANOVA is used to analyze demographics with three groups.

Table 4

Gender Difference on Study Variables (N = 200)

Variables	Male (n=149) M	SD	Female (n=51) M	SD	t(198)	p	95% CI LL	UL	Cohen' d
Mach	64.38	9.06	59.08	11.33	3.35	.00	2.19	8.42	.51
BOC	18.54	4.38	14.38	5.28	.53	.59	-1.08	1.89	.85
TLC	31.15	6.47	28.14	8.25	2.65	.00	.77	5.56	.40
CR	10.62	2.73	10.06	3.50	1.16	.24	-.38	1.50	.17
AME	11.27	2.63	10.78	3.19	1.08	.27	-.40	1.39	.16
PME	9.26	3.31	7.46	3.79	3.02	.00	.66	3.25	.50

Note. Mach = Machiavellianism, BOC = Bureaucratic Organizational Culture, TLS = Transactional leadership style, CR =Contingent Reward, AME =   Active Management- by- Exception, PME = Passive Management- by- Exception

Table 4 shows the findings of an independent sample t-test, which show that females have a lower score on Machiavellianism than males. Males use more Machiavellian traits to obtain goals than females, indicating a considerable disparity between the two genders. Furthermore, males have a significantly higher score on transactional leadership style and there sub-scales than females, indicating that males have a higher leadership quality. However, males have a higher mean value in bureaucratic organizational culture than females, indicating that males are perceived to be more bureaucratic in organization.

Table 5

Job Designations Differences on Study Variables (N = 200)

Variables	Under 16 scale (n=106)		Above 16 scale (n=94)		t(198)	p	95% CI		Cohen'
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*			*LL*	*UL*	*d*
Mach	61.00	10.16	65.37	9.16	-3.17	.00	-7.07	-1.65	.04
BOC	19.66	3.26	18.40	3.72	2.51	.01	.27	2.23	.36
TLS	30.62	6.8	31.56	5.6	-.51	.00	-2.19	1.28	.15
CR	10.87	2.75	10.47	2.53	1.05	.29	-.34	1.14	.15
AME	11.50	2.46	11.28	2.38	.67	.50	-.42	.87	.09
PME	8.29	3.82	9.30	3.35	-2.00	.04	-2.01	-.01	.28

Note. Mach = Machiavellianism, BOC = Bureaucratic Organizational Culture, TLS = Transactional leadership style, CR = Contingent Reward, AM = Active Management- by- Exception, PME = Passive Management- by- Exception

Table 5 shows the findings of an independent sample t-test, which show that the significant difference on job designations, higher the work designation, the greater the Machiavellianism in both males and females, indicating that there are significant differences between males and females on various job designations. It reveals that the higher the post, the more Machiavellianism and transactional leadership styles are present and organization culture would be bureaucratic in nature.

Table 6

Comparison of Education on Study Variables (N=200)

Variables	F.A (*n*=10)	B.A (*n*=39)	Master& M.Phil. (*n*=127)	PhD & Others (*n*=24)				*Tukey's Post Hoc*
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*F*	*P*	*n'*	
Mach	58.70	63.76	63.07	63.66	.73	.53	.004	
	8.74	7.3	10.90	8.48				
BOC	16.00	20.02	18.94	19.45	3.7	.01	.05	3>1,4>1
	4.66	2.91	3.58	3.06				
TLS	28.20	30.79	30.79	32.20	.96	.40	.05	
	8.36	6.34	6.18	5.83				
CR	10.10	10.43	10.70	11.25	.63	.59	.02	
	2.88	2.13	2.66	2.47				
AME	10.70	11.30	11.44	11.66	.43	.72	.01	
	4.71	2.22	2.26	2.16				
PME	7.50	9.02	8.69	9.29	.65	.58	.02	
	3.89	3.12	3.83	3.25				

Note. Mach = Machiavellianism, BOC = Bureaucratic Organizational Culture, TLS = Transactional leadership style, CR =Contingent Reward, AME = Active Management- by- Exception, PME = Passive Management- by- Exception

Table 6 shows the impact of education on the study variables. Employees in the ministry were divided into categories based on the number of years they had served. There were 10 in the F.A, 39 in the B.A, 127 in the M.Phil.and 24 in the PhD. and others. There were significant differences among government (ministry) employees on the bureaucratic organizational culture scale, indicating that when employees obtain higher education (Masters and M.Phil.) there will be a bureaucratic

organization. One of the subscale contingent rewards showed a significant difference, indicating that as education levels rise, contingent rewards rise as well, especially at the Masters and M.Phil. Levels.

Table 7

Comparison of Monthly Income on Study Variables (N=200)

Variables	Below 50000 (*n*= 19)	50000-100000 (*n*=107)	100000-150000 (*n*=60)	Above 150000 (*n*=14)	F	*p*	*n'*	*Tukey's Post Hoc*
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*				
Mach	59.63 7.16	63.57 9.98	63.90 10.47	60.21 9.72	1.38	.24	.05	
BOC	17.42 6.42	19.61 4.40	19.11 3.36	16.92 4.15	4.12	.00	.05	2>1,3>1
TLS	25.57 6.64	31.30 6.55	32.20 5.18	28.35 3.73	6.73	.00	.11	3>1,2>1, 3>4,2>4
CR	8.05 3.65	10.69 2.92	11.05 2.18	9.71 3.42	5.95	.01	.06	3>1,2>1
AME	10.05 2.91	11.52 2.28	11.85 2.09	10.42 1.86	3.96	.00	.05	2>1,3>1, 3>4
PME	6.47 3.40	8.92 3.61	9.35 3.21	8.21 3.57	3.32	.02	.06	2>4,3>1, 2>1

Note. Mach = Machiavellianism, BOC = Bureaucratic Organizational Culture, TLS = Transactional leadership style, CR =Contingent Reward, AME = Active Management- by- Exception, PME = Passive Management- by- Exception

In Table 7The results of the study variables on monthly income are shown Significant positive differences were identified in the outcomes of bureaucratic organizational culture and transactional leadership style, indicating that the greater the income, the more bureaucratic and higher the transactional leadership style in the organizational culture. The groups that scored between 100000 and 150000 had

higher scores on Machiavellianism, bureaucratic organizational culture, and transactional leadership styles which indicate that higher the income higher the Machiavellianism, bureaucratic organizational culture, and transactional leadership styles.

Chapter 4

Discussion

The purpose of the study is to see how ministry employees used Machiavellianism and transactional leadership styles in their organizations while working in a bureaucratic environment. Furthermore, how Machiavellianismimpact on theorganizational employees and initiatives to describe and research transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture began to emerge as crucial themes associated to the effective running of firms.The sample was obtained from Rawalpindi and Islamabad government ministry departments.

Machiavellianism-IV (Christie &Geis, 1970) has an alpha reliability coefficient of.75, which is a notable value in terms of the scale cultural applicability. For a sample of (*N*=200) ministry employees, the transactional leadership style questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2004) had a score of.69, while the bureaucratic organizational culture scale (Wallach, 1983) had a score of .74. All of the reliabilities are outstanding to good.

Relationship betweenMachiavellianism, Transactional Leadership Style and Bureaucratic Organizational Culture

For the investigation, several hypotheses were developed. The study first hypothesis was that "there will be a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and transactional leadership style among government employees." The hypothesis is accepted, (seeTable 3) revealed that the significant positive relationship between Machiavellianism and transactional leadership style at (**p.01).The first hypothesis is accepted, the employees with higher levels of Machiavellianism are more likely to engage in socially harmful behaviors and follow a transactional leadership style, and also show a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and transactional leadership style by (Baum, 2017). It means that employees will be higher Machiavellian trait follow a transactional leadership style.

The second study hypotheses were that "there will be a positive relationship between Machiavellianism and bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees." The findings supported the hypothesis, (see Table 3) revealed that significant positive relationship between Machiavellianism and bureaucratic organizational culture at (**p.01).According to a study (Michel, &Girodo, 1998) Machiavellianism and bureaucratic organizational culture have been shown a positively correlate with each other. One more evidences show that Machiavellianism has a positive relationship with bureaucratic organizational culturePilch and Turska (2015) findings indicate that Machiavellianism and bureaucratic organizational culture have a positive association between them, if employees possess the Machiavellianism attribute,the organization would be bureaucratic in nature.

The third and the last hypothesis is that "therewill be a positive relationship between transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture among government employees." The findings were also support the hypothesis(see table 3). Saeed and Mughal (2017) conduct a research and the findings reveal that transactional leadership style was positive related to bureaucratic organizational culture. In addition, according to Longe (2014) transactional leadership style has a positive impact on bureaucratic organizational culture. The transactional leadership style aids in the creation and maintenance of a setting in which organizational and human capabilities are maximized by allowing employees to earn both tangible and intangible rewards and leadership style will also aid in the creation of a performance-enhancing atmosphere by expressing a fascinating vision that will improve overall organizational recitation (Longe, 2014).

Comparison of Demographics on Study Variables

Some demographic variables, such as job experience and age, were now described as having non-significant relationship with the main variables. It is clear that Machiavellianism was more prevalent in organizations at any stage of life. Employees of all ages can gain leadership skills and easily continue working in a bureaucratic organizational culture.

In this study, significant mean differences between male and female employees were founded in the areas of Machiavellianism, Transactional leadership

style, and Bureaucratic organizational culture, where males scored higher than females. There were non-significant differences between male and female on bureaucratic organizational cultures (see Table 4). According to demographic studies,research has been found that there were significantdifferences between male, male continuously exhibit higher levels of Machiavellianism than females (Austin, 2007; Abell, Brewer, & Lyons, 2013; Jones &Paulhus, 2009). Gender differences have also had an impact on transactional leadership style, males in comparison to females, have stronger leadership abilities to achieve success and achieve goals(Bass, 1985).

In job designations the results showed that there were significant mean differences in male and female, the higher the post, the more Machiavellianism tendencies in employees with transactional leadership styles.According to study, Machiavellians are very career-oriented individuals who take leadership jobs in order to influence colleagues (Bratton &Kacmar, 2004). Employees with a high need for achievement have a strong desire to perform at a high level in order to meet the job high expectations.Individuals with a strong desire for power utilize it to make manipulative plans for personal advantage and to help others to achieve their aims. High Mach's may have an impact on the organization in which they work as well as the people around them.

The employee's educational levels revealed significant difference on bureaucratic organizational culture scale, it would be indicating that when people obtain higher education (Masters and M.Phil.), the organizational culture becomes bureaucratic in nature. Literature on bureaucratic organizational culture, were found to be abundantdata on relationship between culture and higher education by Masland (1985) reported that bureaucratic organizational culture can affect the employees and organization, higher the education higher the bureaucratic tendencies. Furthermore, the findings of the study may be useful to higher education bureaucrats and staff because, leader'seducation have an impact on organizational culture (Bass, 1999). One of the study findings for man with above average education, indicate that Machiavellianism is linked to higher levels of professional status and higher earnings(Turner & Martinez, 1977).

There was a strong link between income and bureaucratic organizational culture and transactional leadership. It can be stated that culture is an abstract construct that provides precise rules and norms under which an employee must operate in order to attain desired goals in an organization. In Machiavellianism, however, there were non-significant difference with monthly income and have significant differences with bureaucratic organizational culture and transactional leadership style.The findings revealed that employees fall 100000-150000 in this category have a higher level of Machiavellianism, bureaucratic organizational culture, and transactional leadership style than in many other categories. Love of money has a direct and significant association with Machiavellianism (Tang & Chen, 2008). Money is mostly examined on the basis of employees' salaries (Mitchell &Mickel, 1999; Tang & Chen, 2008).

Limitations and Suggestions

Regardless of how skillfully a study is carried out, every study has significant limitations. The current study has various limitations that should be taken into account when analyzing the findings and contributions. The following are some of the study limitations.

1. The sample was chosen using a convenience sampling technique and was drawn from government organizations in Islamabad and Rawalpindi, which only represent a small geographical area, therefore results may be difficult to generalize to other parts of Pakistan.

2. It is advised that the study sample region canbe expanded.A male-to-female ratio of 1:1 was not chosen. It is suggested that an equal number of samples be taken in order to make the sample more comparable.

3. Employees that conduct in accordance with the organizations suitable behaviors should be recognized and appreciated in order for these behaviors to be approved.

4. Because the sample employed in the study was insufficient, a sample from a different organization should be obtained.

5. Behavioral observations or cross-validation procedures could be used in future study to bolster these findings.

Implication of the Study

1. Organizations would benefit from recognizing the detrimental impact of Machiavellianism and transactional leadership on employees.
2. This research adds to the recent craze for Machiavellianism, transactional leadership, and bureaucratic organizational culture in Pakistan, where there is relatively little literature.
3. The findings of this study demonstrate the critical necessity of transactional leadership in the workplace. After analyzing the data, it is recommended that for routine task organization would adopt transactional style of leadership and used when there is complexity in job and interrelated tasks.
4. Our findings suggest that people with high Machiavellianism are attentive to their leader's behavior and adapt their actions to leaders who highlight the reward certain behaviors.
5. Lastly, the finding of the present study gave new gateways to others researchers to study these constructs with others sample, culture sand population.

Conclusion

The study shows that Machiavellianism, bureaucratic organizational culture, and transactional leadership style have a significant positive relationship. Employees who are high on Machiavellianism have shown a predisposition for engaging in counterproductive work conduct in order to achieve their aims and interests, as well as transactional work behavior while using bureaucratic organizational culture, leadership style provides critical assistance to make the organization members feel safe and proud of their organization. There was a significant difference between male and female employees in terms of Machiavellianism and transactional leadership style among demographic characteristics.Job designations were also shown to have a significant association between male and female. Among educational level of the employees those who completed masters and MPhil, degrees have significant results

on bureaucratic organizational culture show that education does not meaning by using Machiavellianism and transactional leadership style, while earning money, transactional leadership style and bureaucratic organizational culture have an immense impact.

References

Abell, L., Brewer, G., & Lyons, M. (2013). It's not just a man-thing: Testing sex as a moderator between peer attachment and Machiavellianism, competition and self-disclosure. *Individual Differences Research*, *11*(3), 114-120.

Austin, E. J., Farrelly, D., Black, C., & Moore, H. (2007). Emotional intelligence, Machiavellianism and emotional manipulation: *Does EI have a dark side, Personality and individual differences, 43*(1), 179-189.

Avolio, B. J., &Sivasubramaniam, N., (1998). Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire, *the leadership quarterly. 14*(3), 261-295.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The leadership quarterly*, *6*(2), 199-218.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (2004).Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *72*(4), 441-462.

Ayan, F. (2017). Factors influencing change management in organizations*: A case study of World Food Programme–Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa), 3(1), 7- 23.

Bagozzi, R. P., Verbeke, W. J., Dietvorst, R. C., Belschak, F. D., van den Berg, W. E., &Rietdijk, W. J. (2013). Theory of mind and empathic explanations of Machiavellianism: A neuroscience perspective. *Journal of Management*, *39*(7), 1760-1798.

Bass, B. J. Avolio, (1995) "The Implication of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Individual teams, and Organizational Development," *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 4(1), 231- 272.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best.*Journal of Organizational Dynamics*, *13*(3), 26-40.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, *8*(1), 9-32.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J., (2000).The future of leadership in learning organizations.*Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 7*(3), 18-40.

Bass, B. M., &Stogdill, R. M. (1999), *Handbook of leadership:* Theory, research, and managerial application, 408-412.

Bass, B. M., (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(4), 468–478.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Jung, D. I. (1999).Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, *72*(4), 441-462.

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., &Bebb, M. (1985).Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect.*Journal of group & organization Studies*, *12*(1), 73-87.

Bass. B. M., Waldrnan. D. A., Avolio. B.J.,&Rebb. M. (1987).Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect.*Journal of Organizational Studies*.*12*(1), 73-78.

Bateman, T. S., O'Neill, H., &Kenworthy-U'Ren, A. (2002).A hierarchical taxonomy of top managers' goals.*Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(6), 1134.

Baum, K., &Krulwich, D. (2017).A New Approach to PD--and Growing Leaders. *Educational Leadership*, *74*(8), 62-66.

Becker, J. A., & Dan O'Hair, H. (2007).Machiavellians' motives in organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *35*(3), 246-267.

Berlin, I. (2013). The originality of Machiavelli. *Princeton University Press, 4*(66), 33-100.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, *89*(5), 901-910.

Bratton, V. K. Kacmar, K. M., Witt, L. A., Carlson, D. S., &Zivnuska, S., (2004). Interactive effects of impression management and organizational politics on job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *25*(5), 627-640.

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006).Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. *Journal of applied psychology*, *91*(4), 954-962.

Burns, J, M., (1978). Book Reviews: Leadership,*Journal of international relations,6*(4), 723.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., &Menon, S. T. (2000),*74*(1), 153-156.

Butcher, J. N., Spielberger, C. D., (2013). *Advances in Personality Assessment, 6.*

Calhoon, R. P. (1969). Machiavelli and the twentieth century administrator. *Academy of management Journal*, *12*(2), 205-212.

Cesario, F., &Chambel, M. J. (2017). Linking organizational commitment and work engagement to employee performance. *Knowledge and Process Management*, *24*(2), 152-161.

Chen, K. K. N. (2004). The burning man organization grows up: Blending bureaucratic and alternative structures. *Journal of Harvard university*.*11* (1), 81-100.

Christie R., &Geis, F. I. (1970).*Studies in Machiavellianism.New York: Academic Press,*93-108.

Colbert, A. E., Courtright, S. H., Oh, I. S., &. Wang, G., (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Journal of group & organization management, 36*(2), 223-270.

Czibor, A., &Bereczkei, T. (2012). Machiavellian people's success results from monitoring their partners. *Journal of personality and Individual Differences*, *53*(3), 202-208.

Czibor, A., Szabo, Z. P., Jones, D. N., Zsido, A. N., Paal, T., Szijjarto, L., &Bereczkei, T. (2017). Male and female face of Machiavellianism: Opportunism or anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *117*, 221-229.

Dahling, J. J., Whitaker, B. G., & Levy, P. E. (2009). The development and validation of a new Machiavellianism scale. *Journal of management*, *35*(2), 219-257.

DansereauJr, F., Graen, G., &Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process.*Journal of organizational behavior and human performance*, *13*(1), 46-78.

Davies, M., & Stone, T. (2003). Synthesis: Psychological understanding and social skills. In B. Repacholi& V. Slaughter (Eds.), *Individual differences in theory of mind: Implications for typical and atypical development, Journal of psychology press,13(1)*, 305–352.

Dawkins, R., & Krebs, J. R. (1978). Animal signals: information or manipulation. *Behavioral ecology: An evolutionary approach*, *2*(1), 282-309.

Deci, E. L. Porac, J., Lathin, D., & Zuckerman, M., (1975). On the importance of self-determination for intrinsically-motivated behavior. *Personality and social psychology*, *4*(3), 443- 448.

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (2001). Extrinsic rewards and intrinsic motivation in education: Reconsidered once again. *Review of educational research*, *71*(1), 1-27.

Demirtao, O., &Bickes, D. M. (2014).Makyavelizm'inOlumsuzDurumlarıIfsaEtmeNiyetiuzerindekiEtkisi: Bir Alan calısması. *Is*, Guc: *The Journal of Industrial Relations & Human Resources*, *16*(2), 98-112.

Elias, R. Z. (2015). The effects of Machiavellianism and cultural dimensions on business students' general distrust of corporations. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, *6*(4), 21-30.

Fehr, B., Samsom, D., and Paulhus, D. L. (1992). The construct of Machiavellianism: twenty years later, *Journal of advances in personality assessment*, 9, 77–116.

Frank, J. B. (1990). Pregnancy and leadership: case study from an inpatient unit. *Psychiatry*, *53*(1), 77-84.

Girodo.Michel. (1998). Machiavellian, bureaucratic, and transformational leadership styles in police managers: Preliminary findings of interpersonal ethics. *Journal of Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *86*(2), 419-427.

Guney, S., &Mandaci, G. (2009).Machiavellianism and other algorithms: the banking sectorHacettepe University.*Journal of the Faculty of Economicsand Administrative Sciences, 27*(2), 83-104.

Gurer, A., &Ciftci, G. E. (2018). The Relation between Machiavellianism, Organizational Commitment and Ethical Leadership*: A Field Research on Academicians in Turkey*,*10*(2), 570-597.

Harris, A. (2007). Distributed leadership: Conceptual confusion and empirical reticence.*International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *10*(3), 315-325.

Johnson, D., Wasson, J., Hays, R., Rubenstein, L., Nelson, E., Leaning, J., &Rosenkrans, C. (1992).The short-term effect of patient health status assessment in a health maintenance organization. *Quality of Life Research*, *1*(2), 99-106.

Jones, D. N., &Paulhus, D. L. (2009). Machiavellianism.*Handbook of individual differences in social behavior,20*(10), 93-108.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 755-768.

Jung, D. I., &Sosik, J. J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Journal of Small group research*, *33*(3), 313-336.

Kara, D. (2009). Machiavellianism, Meta concentrations in some principal component analysis. *Journal of research in personality*, *114*(1), 347-354.

Keller, T., &Dansereau, F. (1995). Leadership and empowerment: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of human relations*, *48*(2), 127-146.

Kezer&Eckel 2008 Advancing diversity agendas on campus: Examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles.*International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11(4), 379-405

Khan, M.J., Mughal, Y.H., Khattak,Z.Z. (2017) Inspirational Motivation and Employees Performance: Moderating Role of Cognitive Style Indicator, *International Journal of Business Studies Review,* 2 (1), 78-87.

Krefting, L. A., & Frost, P. J. (1985). Untangling webs, surfing waves, and wildcatting: A multiple-metaphor perspective on managing organizational culture. *Journal of Organizational culture*, *7*(1), 155-168.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management review*, *12*(4), 648-657.

Kwak, W. J., & Shim, J. H. (2017). Effects of Machiavellian ethical leadership and employee power distance on employee voice. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *45*(9), 1485-1498.

Lee, F. K., Sheldon, K. M., & Turban, D. B. (2003). Personality and the goal-striving process: The influence of achievement goal patterns, goal level, and mental

focus on performance and enjoyment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(2), 256-265.

Longe, Olukayode J. (2014) Leadership style paradigm shift and organizational performance: A case of the Nigerian Cement Industry. *African Research Review, 8*(4), 68-83.

Lorber, M., &Savic, B. (2014). Factors affecting nurses' organizational culture.*Journal of nursing review*, *48*(4), 294-301.

Marková, I. (1987). On the interaction of opposites in psychological processes. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*.*17*(3), 279-299.

Masland, A. T. (1985). Organizational culture in the study of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *8*(2), 157-168.

McGregor, D. (1960). Theory X and theory Y. *Journal of Organization theory*, *358*(374), 5-7.

McHoskey, J. W., Worzel, W., &Szyarto, C. (1998).Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 74(1), 192-210.

McHoskey, John W., (1999) "Machiavellianism and personality dysfunction." *Personality and Individual Differences*, *31*(5), 791-798.

McIlwain, D. (2011). Young Machiavellians and the traces of shame: Coping with vulnerability to a toxic affect, Narcissism *and Machiavellianism in youth: Implications for the development of adaptive and maladaptive behavior*, *American Psychological Association,64(1),*213–231.

Mitchell, T. R., &Mickel, A. E. (1999). The meaning of money: An individual-difference perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 568-578.

Monga, J., Coetzee, M., &Cilliers, F. V. N. (2012).Perceived leadership style and employee participation in a manufacturing company in the democratic republic of Congo.*African journal of business management*, *6*(15), 5389-5398.

Nichols, A. L., & Webster, G. D. (2001).The single-item need to belong scale. *Personality and individual differences*, *55*(2), 189-192.

Northouse Peter G. (2010), Leadership: Theory and Practice,*the Leadership Quarterly* *9*(4), 530-538.

Odumeru, James A; Ogbonna, Ifeanyi George (2013).Transformational vs. Transactional Leadership Theories: Evidence in Literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research. 2(2*), 355–361.

Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. (1993).Leadership style, organizational culture and performance.*Human Resource Management Journal*, *11(*4), 766-788.

Ojokuku, R. M., Odetayo, T. A., &Sajuyigbe, A. S. (2012). Impact of leadership style on organizational performance: a case study of Nigerian banks. *American journal of business and management*, *1*(4), 202-207.

Paal, T., &Bereczkei, T. (2007). Adult theory of mind, cooperation, Machiavellianism: The effect of mindreading on social relations. *Personality and individual differences*, *43*(3), 541-551.

Parry, K. W., & Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organizational settings. *Journal of business ethics*, *35*(2), 75-96.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of research in personality*, 36(6), 556-563.

Pilch, I., &Turska, E. (2015). Relationships between Machiavellianism, organizational culture, and workplace bullying: Emotional abuse from the target's and the perpetrator's perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *128*(1), 83-93.

Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The leadership quarterly*, *15*(3), 329-354.

Rauthmann, J. F. (2013). Investigating the MACH–IV with item response theory and proposing the trimmed MACH. *Journal of personality assessment*, *95*(4), 388-397.

Reed, R., &DeFillippi, R. J. (1990).Causal ambiguity, barriers to imitation, and sustainable competitive advantage.*Academy of management review*, *15*(1), 88-102.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*, Ewe Jersey: Pearson Education, *15(2), 367-396.*

Rosenthal, J., &Masarech, M. A. (2003). High-performance cultures: How values can drive business results. *Journal of Organizational Excellence*, *22*(2), 3-18.

Sadeghi, A., &Pihie, Z. A. L. (2012).Transformational leadership and its predictive effects on leadership effectiveness.*International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *3*(7), 188-199.

Saeed, M., & Mughal, Y. H. (2019). Role of transactional leadership style upon performance: Mediating role of culture. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, *13*(1), 47-57.

Schein, E. H. (2010) John Wiley & Sons. Organizational Culture and leadership.*Journal of organizational psychology, 2(1),* 8-67.

Sheldon, K. M., & Turban, D. B. (2003). Personality and the goal-striving process: The influence of achievement goal patterns, goal level, and mental focus on performance and enjoyment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 256-265.

Slaughter, V., Pritchard, M., & Gibbs, V. (2003). [Individual Differences in Theory of Mind: Implications for Typical and Atypical Development](). Hove, E. Sussex: *Psychology Press, 38*(2), 499-514.

Sofi, M. A. &Devanadhen, D. K., (2015). Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance: An Empirical Assessment of Banking Sector in Jammu and Kashmir. *Journal of Business and Management*, *17*(8), 31-45.

Spielberger, C. D., Butcher, J. N., (2013). A Review of "Silverstein, M. L. (2013).Personality assessment in depth.*Advances in Personality Assessment, 96(5),* 576-587.

Stewart, G. L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of relationships between team design features and team performance.*Journal of management*, *32*(1), 29-55.

Tang, Y., Zhan, X., & Chen, K. (2008). Differential leadership and organizational corruption in China: Mediating role of moral disengagement and moderating role of organizational justice. *Chinese Management Studies*, *12(4),* 795-811.

Tse, H. H., Lam, C. K., Lawrence, S. A., & Huang, X. (2013).When my supervisor dislikes you more than me: The effect of dissimilarity in leader–member exchange on coworkers' interpersonal emotion and perceived help.*Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(6), 974-988.

Turner, C. F., & Martinez, D. C. (1977). Socioeconomic achievement and the Machiavellian personality.*Journalof sociometry*, *40*(4), 325-336.

Uchenwamgbe, B. B. P. (2013). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance in small and medium scale enterprises (SMEs) in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(23), 53-73.

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., &Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behavior: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group & Organization Studies*, *15*(4), 381-394.

Wallach, E. J. (1983). Individuals and organizations: The cultural match. *Training & Development Journal*. 37(2), 28-36.

Wang, C., Wei, S., Xiang, H., Wu, J., Xu, Y., Liu, L., &Nie, S. (2008). Development and evaluation of a leadership training *program* for public health emergency response: results from a Chinese study. *BMC Public Health*, *8*(1), 1-8.

Wastell, C., & Booth, A. (2003).Machiavellianism perspective. *Journal of social and clinical psychology*, *22*(6), 730-744.

Weber, J.Ishizuka, N., &Amaral, D. G. (1990).Organization of intrahippocampal projections originating from CA3.*Journal of psychology*, *295*(4), 580-623.

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organizations, Translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, Edited with an Introduction by Talcott Parsons. New York: *Oxford University Press*, *8*(1), 69-71.

Westrum, R., 2004. A typology of organizational cultures. *Quality of Safe Health Care, 13,* 22-27.

Wilson, D. S., Near, D. C., & Miller, R. R. (1998). Individual differences in Machiavellianism as a mix of cooperative and exploitative strategies. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *19*(3), 203-212.

Wilson, D. S., Near, D., & Miller, R. R. (1996). Machiavellianism: a synthesis of the evolutionary and psychological literatures. *Psychological bulletin*, *119*(2), 285-299.

Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). Interpersonal trust and attitudes toward human nature.*The Journal of Social Psychology, 131*(4), 573-575.

Yahyagil, M. Y., &Yahyagil, M. Y. (2004). The interdependence between the concepts of organizational culture and organizational climate: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Administration*, *33*(1), 69-98.

Zettler, M. L., Schiedek, D., &Bobertz, B. (2007).Benthic biodiversity indices versus salinity gradient in the southern Baltic Sea. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 55(1), 258-270.