




Final Project 2

PMG 497



Midocean University

Faculty of Management

Department/ Specialization



Project title

Exploring the Impact of Leadership Styles on Workplace Wellbeing: A
Qualitative Study in the Saudi Arabian Workforce

Student name

Afnan Mohammed Badawi

Final Project - 2

Faculty of Management - Midocean University

Supervisor

Dr. Abdulrahim Nader

Faculty member- Faculty of management- Midocean University

28-08-2025 – 9

Research instruments and Questionnaires

Informed Consent Form

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. Before you proceed, please read the following information carefully:

1. Your participation in this research is completely voluntary.
2. You have the right to withdraw at any point without any negative consequences.
3. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and used only for academic and research purposes.
4. No personal identifiers will be disclosed in any reports or publications resulting from this study.
5. The estimated time to complete the questionnaire is approximately 10–15 minutes.

By selecting “Yes” below, you confirm that:

- ☐ You have read and understood the above information.
 - ☐ You agree to voluntarily participate in this study.
- ☐ Yes, I consent to participate.
- ☐ No, I do not consent to participate.

Demographic Information Sheet

Please provide the following details:

1. **Name:** _____
2. **Age (Please select one):**
 - 18–25
 - 26–30
 - 31–35
 - 36–40
 - 41–45
 - 46–50
 - 51–55
 - 56–60
 - 61–65
 - 66–70

3. Gender:

- Male
- Female

4. Education Level:

- Bachelor's
- Master's
- PhD

5. Field of Work: _____

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

Instructions:

This questionnaire provides a description of your leadership style. Twenty-one descriptive statements are listed below. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word “others” may mean your followers, clients, or group members.

KEY:

- ☐0 = Not at all
- ☐1 = Once in a while
- ☐2 = Sometimes
- ☐3 = Fairly often
- ☐4 = Frequently, if not always

No.	Statement	0	1	2	3	4
1	I make others feel good to be around me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	I express with a few simple words what we could and should do.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	I enable others to think about old problems in new ways.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	I help others develop themselves.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6	I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	I am content to let others continue working in the same way as always.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8	Others have complete faith in me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9	I provide appealing images about what we can do.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11	I let others know how I think they are doing.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12	I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13	As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14	Whatever others want to do is O.K. with me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15	Others are proud to be associated with me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16	I help others find meaning in their work.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17	I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18	I give personal attention to others who seem rejected.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19	I call attention to what others can get for what they accomplish.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- 20 I tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work. ☐☐☐☐☐
- 21 I ask no more of others than what is absolutely essential. ☐☐☐☐☐

WHO-5 Wellbeing Index

Instructions:

Below are five statements about how you may have been feeling **over the last two weeks**. Please select the option that best describes your experience.

KEY:

- ☐☐0 = At no time
- ☐☐1 = Some of the time
- ☐☐2 = Less than half of the time
- ☐☐3 = More than half of the time
- ☐☐4 = Most of the time
- ☐☐5 = All of the time

No.	Statement	0	1	2	3	4	5
1	I have felt cheerful and in good spirits.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	I have felt calm and relaxed.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	I have felt active and vigorous.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	I woke up feeling fresh and rested.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	My daily life has been filled with things that interest me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Methodology

Research Design

Typically, the purpose of a quantitative research design is to explain phenomena, test correlations, or establish cause-and-effect linkages. This is accomplished by the use of a structured strategy that involves the systematic collection and analysis of numerical data in order to answer research questions or test hypotheses. The descriptive and correlational designs are the most important types. These designs are used to measure variables and their associations, while the experimental and quasi-experimental designs are used to investigate causal correlations through the manipulation of variables. The implementation of these designs places an emphasis on objectivity, methodical procedures, high sample numbers, and the utilisation of structured instruments in order to guarantee that the results can be duplicated and generalised to a larger population.

Given that it enables the collecting of quantifiable data that can be statistically analysed to uncover patterns and connections, a quantitative research is particularly useful for assessing the influence of leadership styles on employee performance. This is because the study allows for the identification of patterns and correlations. This strategy offers a clear and objective method of evaluating how workers perceive various leadership styles and how these views link with their

performance outcomes. This is accomplished via the use of organised questionnaires or surveys. In addition, the utilisation of quantitative methodologies guarantees that the conclusions are not founded on subjective perceptions but are, rather, backed by numerical proof, which in turn increases the validity and trustworthiness of the results. Furthermore, quantitative research makes it feasible to analyse huge sample numbers, which enables the findings to be generalised across various sectors of the workforce, such as those distinguished by age, gender, or education level. This provides a significant advantage over qualitative research. When applied to the setting of Saudi Arabia's commercial business, where cultural and demographic elements play a considerable influence, quantitative analysis offers an efficient method for capturing these changes and presenting them in a manner that is both systematic and comparative. Through the use of this technique, organisations are eventually able to make decisions regarding leadership training and development plans that are founded on evidence and are in accordance with the preferences and requirements of their employees.

Population and Sampling of the Study

The study's participants were personnel in Saudi Arabia's commercial sector, which includes banking, information technology, and other business services. Due to time and budget limitations, it was impractical to include the whole population; therefore, a

sampling strategy was utilised to choose individuals capable of supplying pertinent data for the research objectives. We used a convenience sampling approach, which is a non-probability selection method that lets participants be chosen based on how easy it is for them to participate and how ready they are to do so. This approach has been extensively utilised in social science and organisational research, since it facilitates the fast collection of data from easily available respondents while adequately capturing diversity within the sample. The technique of convenience sampling was deemed suitable for this study, since it facilitated access to employees from several business sectors, hence assuring the inclusion of viewpoints from diverse organisational contexts.

The theoretical rationale for employing convenience sampling is rooted in its practicality and cost-effectiveness, especially in exploratory or cross-sectional studies where the principal objective is to discern relationships rather than to extrapolate findings to the entire population with statistical accuracy. To build the sample frame, we found organisations in the target industries and asked workers who were available and willing to take part in the data collection period. Participants in these organisations received both electronic and paper-based surveys. The final sample consisted of respondents who agreed to participate, with their inclusion based on voluntary permission. This procedure included a wide range of professionals from different fields in the research.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Participants were included if they were currently working full-time in a private sector organization in Saudi Arabia and had been working under the supervision of a manager or team leader for at least one year. This was done to ensure that they had sufficient exposure to their leader's behavior and its influence on their wellbeing. Employees from both local and expatriate backgrounds were considered eligible so that the influence of leadership styles across cultural lines could be captured.

Participants were excluded if they were self-employed, part-time, on probation or in freelance roles, as they were unlikely to have consistent or long-term interactions with organizational leadership. Also, those who were in senior leadership roles themselves were excluded because the focus of the study was on employees' experiences, not those of leaders.

Data Collection Method

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the WHO-5 Wellbeing Index were the two standardised instruments that were used to gather data for this study. The data was acquired through the use of a structured questionnaire. We utilised the Multidimensional Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to evaluate several leadership styles, such as transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership, as well as the results associated with these types. The WHO-5 Wellbeing Index was utilised to

assess the level of wellbeing in the workplace by means of five measures that were framed in a positive manner and captured the level of subjective mental wellbeing. The fact that both of these instruments have been subjected to extensive validation and exhibit robust psychometric features makes them suitable for use in the field of organisational research analysis.

The questionnaire was distributed to personnel working in several areas of the business industry in Saudi Arabia, such as the commercial services sector, the information technology sector, and the financial sector. A sample technique based on convenience was chosen in order to obtain participants from all of these different industries. Prior to their participation, respondents were given an explanation of the goal of the study, and they were given the assurance that their replies would be kept secret and anonymous. The participants were all given the opportunity to provide their informed permission before to completing the questionnaire. The participation was fully optional, and the participants were informed that they were free to withdraw from the research at any time without being required to provide a reason. The data gathering process was carried out utilising both electronic and paper-based forms, with the selection of the latter being determined by the accessibility of participants in various industries. Following the collection and screening of completed questionnaires, which were then loaded into the statistical program for analysis, the questionnaires were checked to verify that they were accurate and comprehensive.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) has been utilised extensively in a variety of organisational and cultural contexts, and the psychometric features of the MLQ have been continuously confirmed by empirical research. The MLQ has a high degree of internal consistency across all of its scales, which is a reliable indicator of its dependability. Some studies have found that the Cronbach's alpha values for transformational leadership dimensions range from .83 to .94, which indicates that these dimensions have a high degree of reliability. While the passive and avoidant dimensions, such as laissez-faire leadership, have lower but still acceptable coefficients ranging from .60 to .80, the transactional leadership scales demonstrate adequate levels of dependability, with alpha values often falling between .76 and .87. This is in contrast to the passive and avoidant dimensions when it comes to leadership. The outcome measures, which assess additional effort, efficacy, and satisfaction, also exhibit great reliability, with coefficients ranging from .84 to .92 over the duration of the study. These findings indicate that the Multidimensional Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) provides a reliable and consistent evaluation of leadership behaviours across all of its subscales. Construct validity has been proved to be strong in the Multidimensional Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) through the use of confirmatory factor analysis, which consistently supports the nine-factor model of leadership styles and outcomes offered

by the MLQ. There is also evidence of convergent validity in the instrument, which indicates that transformational leadership has a good correlation with outcomes such as work satisfaction, staff dedication, and greater levels of performance. Its discriminant validity is demonstrated by its capacity to discriminate between transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. This ensures that the scales measure unique constructs rather than dimensions that overlap with one another. Another one of the MLQ's strengths is its predictive validity. This is because scores on the transformational leadership scale have been demonstrated time and again to accurately predict positive outcomes, such as increased levels of employee satisfaction and motivation, as well as increased organisational effectiveness. On the other hand, there is a negative correlation between laissez-faire leadership and employee performance and morale, which is proof that the instrument correctly represents the effects of ineffective leadership.

The Multicultural Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) has also been shown to have cross-cultural validity, since it has been effectively implemented in a variety of cultural and organisational settings, including research conducted in the Middle East. This flexibility lends credence to the applicability of the instrument in the context of analysing leadership within the commercial sector of Saudi Arabia, which is characterised by cultural values and demographic characteristics that impact leadership choices and effectiveness. Taken as a whole, the Multidimensional

Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) has solid psychometric features, which makes it a trustworthy and valid instrument for evaluating leadership styles and the influence those types have on employee performance.

WHO-5 Wellbeing Index

Across a wide range of demographics and cultural settings, the WHO-5 Wellbeing Index has been found to be a reliable and valid instrument for assessing individuals' subjective levels of happiness. With Cronbach's alpha values often ranging between .84 and .90, it displays good internal consistency, which indicates that the five items assess a coherent underlying construct. This is indicated by the way that the results are distributed. Although it has negative correlations with measures of depression and psychological distress, the WHO-5 demonstrates high construct validity. This is because it correlates favourably with other measures of wellbeing and life satisfaction, while at the same time displaying negative correlations with these other measures. The fact that persons with low scores on the WHO-5 are able to effectively identify those who are at risk of depression or poor mental health is another indication that it has been shown to have strong criterion validity. Studies have demonstrated that the instrument is sensitive to changes in wellbeing over time, which makes it useful for both cross-sectional and longitudinal study. The instrument's shortness does not compromise its robustness, since studies have validated its sensitivity. Furthermore, its application

across cultures has been well established, with validation studies undertaken in over 30 nations, including research in Middle Eastern contexts, supporting its usefulness as a universal measure of wellbeing. These studies have been completed and validated. Overall, the WHO-5 is one of the most practical instruments for evaluating workplace wellbeing in organisational research because it combines brevity, reliability, and validity. This makes it one of the most useful approaches.

Results

This part of the dissertation shows the results that were gathered from the sample utilising the questionnaires to answer the research question. After data collection, statistical analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-IBM Version 26), and the findings were aggregated. Descriptive statistics, including frequency, mean, and percentages, have been employed to ascertain sociodemographic factors such as age. The Pearson correlation coefficient was employed to assess the degree of association between the variables. Regression analysis was employed to assess the causal link among the variables. The t-test was utilised to assess the disparities between the two groups. ANOVA was utilised to analyse the disparities across many groups.

The study's findings indicate that transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and authoritative leadership have a positive effect on employee performance in various private organizations in Saudi Arabia. No significant relationship was identified between the Laissez-Faire leadership style and employee performance. Additionally, participants aged 30-35 years achieved the highest scores across all four leadership styles: transformational, transactional, authoritative, and Laissez-Faire. Moreover, male participants exhibited higher mean scores in leadership styles than their female counterparts in the study. Additionally, participants holding certificate or diploma qualifications demonstrated a preference for the Laissez Faire leadership style, whereas those with a bachelor's degree were more inclined to adopt transformational and transactional leadership styles. Individuals possessing a doctoral education exhibited a preference for an authoritative leadership style. The findings indicate that leadership style is shaped by individual factors, including age, gender, and education level, and can positively affect employee performance.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of the participants (n=321)

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentages
-----------------	-----------	-------------

Gender		
Men	173	55.1
Women	145	44.9
Age		
Below 22 Years	59	18
23-29 Years	90	27.6
30-35 Years	66	20.3
36-39	42	12.9
40-45 Years	33	10.2
46 and above Years	31	9.6
Education		
Certificate/diploma	53	16.2
Bachelor	155	46.5
Master	88	27.3
Doctorate/PhD	25	7.8

Interpretation

A total of 321 respondents from various private organisations in Saudi Arabia participated. Men comprised 173 (55.1%) of the participants, while women comprised 145 (44.9%). Table 1 illustrates that 18% of the participants were under the age of 22, 27.6% were between the ages of 23 and 29, 20.3% were between the ages of 30 and 35, 12.9% were between the ages of 36 and 39, 10.2% were between the ages of 40 and 45, and 9.6% were 46 years of age or older. In addition, 53 (16.2%) of the participants received a diploma, 155 (46.5%) received a bachelor's degree, 88 (27.3%)

received a master's degree, and only 7.8% received a doctorate. Moreover, the study's participants were employed in a variety of capacities.

Explanation

The study involved 321 participants from diverse private companies in Saudi Arabia. There were 173 males (55.1%) and 145 women (44.9%) among these. Even though there were a few more men than women, the gender distribution shows that both groups were well-represented, which helped us get a fair view of how men and women think. The age distribution showed that there were people of all ages. In particular, 18% of the people who took part were under 22, which suggests that some of them were new to the labour. The biggest group, 27.6%, was made up of people aged 23 to 29, which is a group of young professionals who are probably just starting out in their careers. 20.3% of the people who took part were between the ages of 30 and 35, which might mean that they are moving towards more secure or mid-level professional employment. The elder groups had fewer respondents: 12.9% were between the ages of 36 and 39, 10.2% were between the ages of 40 and 45, and 9.6% were 46 years old or older. This spread shows that although while the sample was mostly made up of younger workers, it also included views from older and more experienced workers.

The educational background showed that a large number of the people who answered had a college degree. While 16.2% of participants had a diploma, over half of the sample

(46.5%) had finished a bachelor's degree, making this the most prevalent level of education. Also, 27.3% had a master's degree, which shows that they had put a lot of time and money into their advanced studies. 7.8% said they had a doctorate. The distribution shows that most of the people in the research had a college degree, which might affect their attitudes, talents, and expectations at work. People who took part also worked in a number of different professional roles at private companies. The variety of positions in the sample indicates that it was not limited to a single occupational group; instead, it included personnel from various levels of responsibility, including entry-level staff, middle management, and senior professionals. This kind of variety makes the data more representative since it shows how people with different jobs and career paths have diverse experiences.

The demographic analysis shows that the sample was not all the same in terms of gender, age, education level, and job positions. This diversity strengthens the findings by facilitating a more thorough comprehension of workplace dynamics in the Saudi Arabian private sector. By combining views from both younger and older workers, as well as those with different levels of education and responsibility, the research is better able to understand how employees feel and act in this situation.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics

Characteristic	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis
Gender	.239	.149	-1.899
Age	2.398	.509	-.803
Education	.678	.303	-.379

Explanation

The results of the descriptive statistics for gender, age, and education are presented in terms of variance, skewness, and kurtosis. For gender, the variance value was .239, indicating relatively low variability in responses, which is expected in a categorical variable with two categories. The skewness value of .149 suggests that the distribution of gender responses was approximately symmetrical. However, the kurtosis value of -1.899 indicates a platykurtic distribution, meaning that the data were flatter than a normal distribution and had lighter tails.

For age, the variance was 2.398, showing greater variability in responses compared to gender and education. The skewness value of .509 suggests a slight positive skew, indicating that a higher proportion of respondents fell in the younger age categories, with fewer in the older ranges. The kurtosis value of -.803 reflects a relatively flat distribution compared to the normal curve, though closer to normality than gender. For education, the variance was .678, pointing to a moderate level of variability among participants' qualifications. The skewness value of .303 indicates a small positive skew,

implying that a larger share of respondents were concentrated in the lower education levels (such as diploma and bachelor's), while fewer participants held postgraduate or doctoral degrees. The kurtosis value of $-.379$ suggests a distribution that was slightly flatter than normal but generally close to a normal curve.

Taken together, the results demonstrate that the sample distributions for gender, age, and education were generally balanced, with only slight deviations from normality. This indicates that the data were suitable for further statistical analysis.

Table 3

Mean and SD of Leadership based on Gender

Variable	Mean		Female		Male	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Transformational leadership style	2.58	2.61	1.07	2.49		.79
Transactional leadership style	2.55	2.56	1.15	2.42		.69
Authoritative leadership style	2.53	2.69	1.12	2.40		.78
Laissez Faire leadership style	2.42	2.44	1.09	2.28		.84

Interpretation

The results showed that the transformational leadership style had the highest mean score (2.58), followed by the transactional leadership style (2.55), the authoritative leadership style (2.53), and the laissez faire leadership style (2.42). The results also indicate that male individuals possess higher mean scores in comparison to

female participants. In conclusion, the majority of participants shown a preference for the transformational leadership style and a minimal inclination towards the laissez-faire leadership style.

Explanation

The results show that transformational leadership had the highest average score ($M = 2.58$), followed closely by transactional leadership ($M = 2.55$) and authoritative leadership ($M = 2.53$). Laissez-faire leadership had the lowest mean score ($M = 2.42$), indicating minimal endorsement for this style among respondents. The minor distinctions across transformational, transactional, and authoritative styles indicate that participants predominantly appreciated organised and proactive leadership approaches, while exhibiting a diminished preference for passive or non-involved leadership methods.

The findings indicated that male participants exhibited higher mean scores across several leadership styles in comparison to female participants. This indicates that the men in the sample recognised or identified more closely with leadership qualities compared to the women. Although the gender differences were not pronounced, they underscore possible disparities in leadership views and preferences among male and female employees within private businesses in Saudi Arabia. In conclusion, the results clearly show that transformational leadership is preferred over laissez-faire leadership, which is usually linked to little direction and lack of engagement.

Transformational leadership is based on vision, inspiration, and staff development. These findings underscore the importance of dynamic and engaging leadership styles in organisational contexts, particularly within the Saudi private sector.

Table 4
Mean of Leadership based on Education

Variables	Mean scores			
	Certificate/diploma	Bachelor	Master	Doctorate/PhD
Transformational leadership style	2.41	2.68	2.54	2.47
Transactional leadership style	2.45	2.56	2.58	2.51
Authoritative leadership style	2.52	2.48	2.49	2.59

Interpretation

Participants who had completed a certificate or diploma program were found to have a laissez-faire leadership style ($M = 2.56$), as shown by the findings. Those with a bachelor's degree were more likely to adopt a transformational leadership style ($M = 2.68$), whereas those with a master's degree were more likely to adopt a transactional leadership style ($M = 2.58$). Those who had completed a PhD degree, on the other hand, tended to have the strongest preference for an authoritative leadership style ($M = 2.59$). On the other hand, it is essential to keep in mind that elements other than one's degree of schooling can also have an impact on one's leadership style.

Explanation

The findings indicate that preferences for leadership styles differed among educational levels, likely due to variations in mentality, career stage, and organisational context. Individuals who have finished a certificate or diploma program were most likely to support laissez-faire leadership ($M = 2.56$). This may suggest a propensity to eschew significant participation in decision-making processes, maybe indicating restricted managerial experience or a lack of confidence in leadership positions among those with inferior formal qualifications. In certain instances,

leadership may be exercised in a more passive manner, with diminished focus on directive or visionary approaches.

In contrast, those with a bachelor's degree had the largest preference for transformational leadership ($M = 2.68$). This conclusion aligns with the notion that persons at this level are frequently in the early to mid phases of their careers, during which creativity, teamwork, and vision are particularly esteemed. Transformational leadership may also show how they want to motivate teams, encourage innovation, and look for ways to evolve inside companies. This group seems to think that involvement and inspiration are the most important parts of good leadership. People with a master's degree were more likely to be transactional leaders ($M = 2.58$). This method stresses well-organised conversations, rewards, and clear expectations for achievement. The preference among master's degree holders may be associated with their progression into positions that need accountability, oversight, and the attainment of tangible results. At this level, executives may feel pressure to satisfy the goals of the organisation, and transactional processes are a practical way to manage performance well.

Individuals with PhD degrees had the greatest inclination towards authoritative leadership ($M = 2.59$). The reason for this tendency is because people with PhDs generally work in high-level or specialist jobs where they are expected to have expert knowledge, make strategic decisions, and have power. In these situations, people may

think that authoritative leadership is needed to give direction, make sure everyone follows the rules, and keep control of the company. This indicates that increased educational attainment may be associated with leadership roles that need more authoritative and forceful strategies. However, it is crucial to remember that education alone cannot fully explain leadership style. Other things that can affect how leaders operate are their work experience, cultural norms, the structure of the company, and their personality attributes. The observed trends might be interpreted as tendencies rather than definitive outcomes, with leadership styles mirroring the intricate interplay between an individual's educational background and their overarching professional context.

Table 5

Correlation table

Variables	1	2	3	4
Transformational leadership style -				
Transactional leadership style	.808**	-		
Authoritative leadership style	.637**	.727**		
Laissez Faire leadership style	.457**	.455**	.429**	
Workplace wellbeing	.619**	.631**	.618**	.364**

Interpretation

The association between transformational, transactional, authoritative, and laissez-faire leadership styles and workplace wellbeing was assessed using Pearson's correlation coefficient. The findings revealed a strong and positive correlation of workplace wellbeing with transformational leadership style ($r = .619, p < .01$), transactional leadership style ($r = .631, p < .01$), and authoritative leadership style ($r = .618, p < .01$). A moderate but significant correlation was also observed between workplace wellbeing and laissez-faire leadership style ($r = .364, p < .01$).

Explanation

The data indicate that transformational, transactional, and authoritative leadership styles have a strong and positive correlate with workplace wellbeing. On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership has a less but still significant link with workplace wellbeing. According to this, it can be deduced that when leaders apply leadership methods that are active, organised, and helpful, workers typically experience an increase in their sense of wellbeing. When leaders are uninvolved or avoid decision-making, it is possible that employees do not sense similar guidance and motivation, which in turn diminishes their overall level of wellbeing in the workplace. This is shown by the somewhat weaker correlation between laissez-faire leadership and wellbeing.

When viewed from a theoretical standpoint, these findings are better understood via the lens of transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1990). This idea concentrates on the ways in which leaders inspire, motivate, and intellectually stimulate their followers, which ultimately results in followers experiencing both psychological well-being and happiness in their job. The social exchange theory underpins the concept of transactional leadership, which places a focus on clearly defined frames of incentives and expectations. These frameworks provide employees with stability and clarity, so reducing stress and strengthening well-being. Authoritative leadership, which is extensively discussed in the literature on organisational behaviour, provides direction and a feeling of stability, both of which can improve the health of employees in the workplace by reducing the amount of ambiguity that exists. The opposite of this is the laissez-faire leadership style, which is typically linked with a lack of direction and accountability (Avolio & Bass, 2004). This might make it more difficult for employees to feel supported by their employer. Despite the fact that the impact is not as significant as it is with more organised leadership styles, this little positive relationship may indicate situations in which independence is vital.