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ABSTRACT

One of the biggest challenges facing leaders today is the need to develop new business models that stress on effective leadership styles, employee job satisfaction and sustainability without sacrificing the financial and non-financial performance. The objective of this study is to examine the relationship between leadership styles and business performance of multinational companies operating in Malaysia mediated by job satisfaction. A quantitative study, using self-administered structured questionnaire, are issued using purposive sampling via direct distribution to 150 employees working in MNC. Analysis using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Partial Least Square (PLS) indicated that spiritual leadership style has the highest significant influence on job satisfaction, followed by authentic leadership style, transformational leadership style, and transactional leadership style. In addition, job satisfaction has a mediating effect on the relationship between each of the leadership styles, namely, transactional, transformational, authentic, and spiritual on business performance.
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INTRODUCTION

The role of leaders in organizations has shifted and the success of any organization depends on the leadership styles applied by the leaders in current business environment. (Saleem, 2015). The globe has been involved in the globalization effect since last decade. “Global village” is the name that called for the phenomenon of the integration of the world economies. Individual firms and nations judged and assessed globally but act locally in the process of globalization (Onodugo, 2012). Multinational Companies (MNC) are the drivers and agents of globalization. MNC had focus their attention in developing countries like Asian countries, African, and some South American that rich in resources.

Leadership plays a vital role in an organizations due to the leader is the primal soul of any organization. Leaders and organizations could improve through understanding different kind of leadership styles as mentioned by Voon, Lo, Ngui and Ayob (2011). Including their potential limitation and benefits in order to responds to the changes in technologies, distribution systems, marketing method, human capital management and resources due to market globalization.
Özer and Tınaztepe (2014) had conducted a study to examine how transformational leaders, transactional leaders, and paternalistic leaders have the highest good impact on firm performance. Other study shows transformational leadership has a better impact on firm performance. The result from Morales, Barrionuevo and Gutiérrez (2012) research shows transformational leadership influences organizational performance positively through organizational learning and innovation. They conclude that transformational leadership is needed for organizations to improve their performance in changing real-life business environments. On other approach, leaders optimize organizational performances through a high level of spiritual leadership and workplace that spirituality play an important role, as a driver of organizational commitment and productivity. (Baldrige National Quality Program, 2005; Fry & Matherly, 2006; Kaplan & Norton, 1992, 1996, 2006).

Emery and Barker (2015) expected transformational leaders will positively increasing employees’ satisfaction and sense of accomplishment with their job because they try to encourage and motivate their followers to take more responsibility. Voon et al. (2011) conducted a study to examine the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction in the public sector in Selangor, Malaysia. The results showed that transformational leadership style has a greater relationship with job satisfaction than transactional leadership.

Studies demonstrates job satisfaction as a crucial component for organizational achievement. It has demonstrated that productivity, efficiency, employee turnover, and organizational performance heavily impacted by job satisfaction (Okpara, Squillace, & Erondu, 2005; Chen, Yang, Shiau, & Wang, 2006; Schroder, 2008). Lee and Ahmad (2009) discovered that levels of job dissatisfaction, high turnover, low participation in decision-making and lack of quality improvement were affected by job satisfaction.

Fry and Matherly (2007); Fry and Slocum (2008) argued that one of the greatest difficulties confronted leaders today is the need to grow new business models that stress on effective leadership style, employees’ job satisfaction and sustainability without giving away revenue profitability, business development, and other indicators of non-financial performance. Moreover, Sim and Yap (1997) argued that there is no best leadership style that suitable for all circumstances and it is difficult to select the best leadership style for better organizational performance.

For that reason, present study is carried out to examine the relationship between leadership styles and business performance of multinational companies operating in Malaysia mediated by job satisfaction. With that saying, this study serves as good platform for filling-up the identified research gaps to have a more comprehensive view of different kinds of leadership styles and its relationship with job satisfaction and business performance which will serve as important reference for MNC that operating in Malaysia. Fig. 1 recapitulates the theoretical model that guided this study.

1. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

1.1. Leadership and Full Range Leadership Theory (FRTL)

Leaders now widen and increase the interest of their subordinate or take an interest in an interaction with their subordinates instead of rely upon their legitimate power to persuade individuals to fulfil their tasks (Northouse, 2007). Daft and Marcic (2006) stated, leadership is one of the key and most important demands in each organization. It is always considered as the way to solve most organizational problems.
According to Antonakis & House (2002), Full Range Leadership Theory (FRLT) is said to be the most researched and accepted leadership approaches during the late 20th century and early 21st century. The leadership field had gone through different stages, from the trait and contingency approaches of the 1930s, the behavioural approaches of the 1950s and 1960s, and contingency theories of the 1960s and 1970s, Antonakis and House (2002) stated the FRLT was the catalyst that drove it forward.

1.2. Transactional Leadership and Job Satisfaction

There is a strong bond between the skill to motivate goal achievement and improved performance through reward structures and leadership made by transactional leadership (Özer & Tınaztepe, 2014; Jung & Chow, 2008; Bass, 1985). Based on a study from Voon et al. (2011), transactional and transformational were found to have positive relationships with employees’ job satisfaction.

H1a: Transactional leadership style has positive influence on job satisfaction

1.3. Transformational Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Transformational leaders are defined as leaders, who engage primarily in creating employees’ self-confidence by assisting them to discover their potential, positively envision the future scenarios for the organizations, participate with subordinates to explore their demands, and working out collaboratively to fulfil their needs and communicate an attainable vision and mission of the organizations to employees (Peterson, Walumbwa, Byron, & Myrowitz, 2009; Northhouse, 2007). Givens (2008) stated, transformational leaders accounted surplus organizational outcomes and work fulfilment by showing respect and confidence in their subordinates and have the ability to influence their subordinate’s behaviour and job satisfaction.

H1b: Transformational leadership style has positive influence on job satisfaction

1.4. Authentic Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Authentic leadership (AL) defined as a pattern of leader behaviour that promotes both positive psychological capacities and positive ethical climate, through encouraging positive self-development (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). Müceldili, Turan, and Erdil (2013) discovered that organizations may also stimulate other positive consequences beside innovativeness, such as job engagement, extra-role performance, and job satisfaction through authentic leadership style.

H1c: Authentic leadership style has positive influence on job satisfaction

1.5. Spiritual Leadership

Spiritual leadership emphasizes the values, attitudes, and behaviours required to intrinsically motivate one’s self and others through a culture based in altruistic values, calling, membership and a transcendent vision (Fry & Matherly, 2006). There is prove that spiritual practices and values are related to leadership effectiveness (Reave, 2005) and that organizations have greater levels of productivity, employee commitment, and customer satisfaction when employees’ spiritual demands are aligned and met with
organizational values and vision (Duschon & Plowman, 2005; Fry, 2005; Malone & Fry, 2003). Hence, employee would gain more job satisfaction under supervision of a spiritual leader.

**H1d**: Spiritual leadership style has positive influence on job satisfaction

1.6. Job Satisfaction and Business Performance

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a positive or pleasing emotional form from the appraisal of one’s job or experience. Employees encouraged to form their attitude towards their jobs by considering their feelings, beliefs and behaviours (Robbins, 2005; Akehurst, Comeche, & Galindo, 2009). Many studies have demonstrated an unusually large impact of the employees’ job satisfaction on business performance (Aziri, 2011). Thus, the requirement in enhancing the employee satisfaction is important since it is an input towards the success of an organization.

**H2**: Job satisfaction has positive influence on business performance

1.7 Business Performance

Business performance is a useful indicator, business owners, investors, management, employees and firms use it for different purposes (Lee, Kim, Seo, & Hight, 2015). Business performance can be described in terms of financial and non-financial indicators (Lebans & Euske, 2006 after Kaplan & Norton, 1992). Yıldız et al. (2014) show that transactional leadership style, transformational leadership style and innovativeness have positive effect on business performance, respectively. Authentic leaders may encourage group virtuousness and potency, these being critical paths leading positively toward organizational performance (Rego, Júnior, & Cunha, 2013). Fry and Matherly (2006) provide additional support for Spiritual leadership theory as a significant and important driver of productivity, organizational commitment and as well as sales growth.

**H3a**: Transactional leadership style has positive influence on business performance

**H3b**: Transformational leadership style has positive influence on business performance

**H3c**: Authentic leadership style has positive influence on business performance

**H3d**: Spiritual leadership style has positive influence on business performance

1.8 Theoretical Framework
1.9. Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between leadership styles and business performance

Goodwin, Wofford, and Whittington (2001) found a positive and significant relationship between transformational leadership style and followers’ commitment, satisfaction and organizational performance. By increasing the motivation and satisfaction among employees, they can provide better productivity, work quality, loyalty, and willing to stay in the organization. Therefore, the way of organization leaders lead their employees to enhance motivation and effectiveness are very crucial. (Suhana, Mardhiah, Zuraidah, Norhasniza & Nooririnah, 2014).

H4a: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between transactional leadership style and business performance
H4b: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between transformational leadership style and business performance
H4c: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between authentic leadership style and business performance
H4d: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between spiritual leadership style and business performance

2. METHODS
2.1. Sample and procedure

The unit of analysis in this study is all employees who work in multinational company (MNC) located in Malaysia. The non-probability sampling was used for a total of 300 self-administrated questionnaires that were directly distributed to employees that working in MNC (face-to-face interview). It is considered enough in this study to achieve minimum response rates of 46% or at least 140 complete return survey form.

2.2. Measures

Transactional and transformational leadership style was measured using the 32-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). The scale was measured using a five-point Likert scale that range from 1 representing “not at all” to 5 representing “frequently”.

Authentic leadership style was measured using the 16-item Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) developed by Walumbwa et al. (2008). The scale was measured using a five-point Likert scale that range from 1 representing “not at all” to 5 representing “frequently”.

Spiritual leadership style was measured using the 17-item Spiritual Leadership Theory (SLT) survey questions developed by Fry (2003); Fry, Vitucci, and Cedillo (2005); Malone and Fry (2003). The scale was measured using a five-point Likert scale that range from 1 representing “not at all” to 5 representing “frequently”.

Job satisfaction was adapted and measured using the 32-item Job Satisfactions Survey (JSS) developed by Spector (1997). The scale was measured using a five-point Likert scale that range from 1 representing “strongly disagree” to 5 representing “strongly agree”.

Business performance was adapted and measured using the 10-item survey questions developed by Lebans and Euske, (2006) after Kaplan and Norton, (1992). The measurement factors are financial performance (5 items) and non-financial performance (5 items). The scale was measured using a five-point Likert scale that range from 1 representing “strongly disagree” to 5 representing “strongly agree”.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Profile of respondents

Out of 300 questionnaires distributed via MNC (250) and public university (50), total 150 completed responses were collected back which have 50% response rate. Balance 150 uncompleted responses were some returned blank or not returned.

| Table 1: Profile of Respondents |
|--------------------------------|
| Variable | Frequency | % |
| Gender |
| Male | 73 | 48.7 |
| Female | 77 | 51.3 |
| Age |
| Below 26 | 30 | 20.0 |
| Age Group | Count | Percentage |
|-----------|-------|------------|
| 26-35     | 82    | 54.7       |
| 36-45     | 29    | 19.3       |
| 46-55     | 7     | 4.7        |
| Above 55  | 2     | 1.3        |

| State     | Count | Percentage |
|-----------|-------|------------|
| Penang    | 98    | 65.3       |
| Kedah     | 34    | 22.7       |
| Perak     | 18    | 12.0       |
| Perlis    | 0     | 0          |
| Others    | 0     | 0          |

| Education | Count | Percentage |
|-----------|-------|------------|
| High School | 15 | 10.0       |
| Diploma     | 24    | 16.0       |
| Degree       | 98    | 65.3       |
| Master Degree | 13 | 8.7        |
| Doctorate PhD | 0  | 0          |

| Current Position | Count | Percentage |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Operator         | 8     | 5.3        |
| Engineer         | 49    | 32.7       |
| Administrative / Executive | 65 | 43.3       |
| Section Head     | 15    | 10.0       |
| Section Manager  | 4     | 2.7        |
| Others           | 9     | 6.0        |

| Industry      | Count | Percentage |
|---------------|-------|------------|
| Consumer Products | 26 | 17.3       |
| Industrial Products | 48 | 32.0       |
| Trading / Services | 30 | 20.0       |
| Technology     | 36    | 24.0       |
| Finance        | 9     | 6.0        |
| Others         | 1     | 0.7        |

| Generational (Year of Birth) | Count | Percentage |
|------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Veterans (1922-1945)         | 0     | 0          |
| Baby Boomers (1946-1964)     | 7     | 4.7        |
| Generation X (1966-1980)     | 38    | 25.3       |
| Generation Y (1981-2000)     | 105   | 70.0       |

| Working Period Under Current Supervisor | Count | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Below 2 years                           | 58    | 38.7       |
| 2-6 years                               | 83    | 55.3       |
| 7-11 years                              | 5     | 3.3        |
| Above 11 years                          | 4     | 2.7        |

| Working Period Under current Employer   | Count | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Below 5 years                           | 109   | 72.7       |
| 5-10 years                              | 29    | 19.3       |
| 11-15 years                             | 6     | 4.0        |
| 16-20 years                             | 4     | 2.7        |
| Above 21 years                          | 2     | 1.3        |

| Working Period Throughout Career        | Count | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Below 5 years                           | 56    | 37.3       |
| 5-10 years                              | 53    | 35.3       |
| 11-15 years                             | 20    | 13.3       |
There were a balance number of respondents in terms of gender which included male participants (48.7%) and female participants (51.3%) in this study. All the respondents is from states in northern region of Malaysia when 54.7% respondents fell between 26-35 age categories and 70% of the respondents are categorized in Generation Y. Furthermore, 74% respondent had at least bachelor degrees or higher level. Majority of the respondents (76%) are currently holding job position either as engineer, administrative, or executive in company. The respondents are mainly come from these four types of industries which included industrial product (32%), technology (24%), trading and services (20%), and consumer product (17.3%). 141 (94%) of the respondents had worked with current supervisor for less than 6 years, and 109 (72.7%) of them worked with current employer for less than 5 years. Quite a number of the respondents having career life around 5 to 10 years (35.3%) or below 5 years (37.3%) and 85 respondents (56.7) worked for less than 2 companies so far.

3.2. Confirmatory factor analysis and aggregation statistics

The constructs indicator’s composite reliability were ranged from 0.926 to 0.979 which exceeded the recommended value of 0.70 by Hair, Hult, Ringle, and Sarstedt (2013). The average variances extracted (AVE) were in the range of 0.690 to 0.919. Besides, another alternative way (Cronbach’s alpha value) to assess the inter item consistency of the measurement items, result also showed that all alpha values were ranged 0.908 to 0.972 which greater than the recommended value of 0.6 by Nunnally and Berstein (1994). Thus, on average, the constructs explains more than half of the variance of its indicators relatively less error remains in the items than the variance explained by the construct and it is proved that the measurement was reliable.

The statistics result indicated that the means of all scale items varying from 3.24 to 3.81. In general, the scale means were above average 3.40, 3.50, 3.38, 3.47, 3.61 and 3.46 respectively indicated that the respondents were realize that relationship exist between leadership styles, job satisfaction, and business performance. In addition, the scale means indicate that the respondents of this study manifested favourable job satisfaction (3.61) toward business performance (3.46) as well.

3.3. Hypothesis testing

In order to test the thirteen hypotheses created, this study proceeds with the path analysis. The R2 value was 0.885 indicated that 88.5% out of 100% of the variance in extent of job satisfaction can be significantly explained by that four types of leadership styles. Whereas the R2 value 0.749 suggested that 74.9% out of 100% of the variances in business performance can be significant explained by job satisfaction.
The bootstrapping was used and the minimum number of bootstrap samples of 5,000 were selected, critical values for a one-tailed test were applied where 1.65 (significance level = 5%), and 2.33 (significance level = 1%) (Hair et al., 2013).

Result presented in Table 2 showed that transactional leadership style (β = 0.150, p < 0.05), transformational leadership style (β = 0.182, p < 0.05), authentic leadership style (β = 0.187, p < 0.05), and spiritual leadership style (β = 0.463, p < 0.01) were positively influences of job satisfaction. Thus, H1a, H1b, H1c and H1d of this study were supported.

H2 was also supported and there was a positive relationship (β = 0.865, p < 0.01) between job satisfaction and business performance.

The result presented in Table 2 shows that transactional leadership style (β = 0.130, p < 0.05), transformational leadership style (β = 0.158, p < 0.05), authentic leadership style (β = 0.162, p < 0.05), and spiritual leadership style (β = 0.401, p < 0.000) were positively influences of business performance. Thus, H3a, H3b, H3c and H3d of this study were supported.

Table 2: PLS Results of Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing

| Hypothesis | Relationship | Coefficient | SE  | t Value | p Value | Supported |
|------------|--------------|-------------|-----|---------|---------|-----------|
| H1a        | TRCLS -> JS  | 0.150       | 0.074 | 2.020** | 0.023   | Yes       |
| H1b        | TRFLS -> JS  | 0.182       | 0.085 | 2.141** | 0.017   | Yes       |
| H1c        | ATTLS -> JS  | 0.187       | 0.083 | 2.253** | 0.013   | Yes       |
| H1d        | SPILS -> JS  | 0.463       | 0.065 | 7.141***| 0.000   | Yes       |
| H2         | JS -> BP     | 0.865       | 0.016 | 53.886***| 0.000   | Yes       |
| H3a        | TRCLS -> BP  | 0.130       | 0.065 | 1.983** | 0.025   | Yes       |
| H3b        | TRFLS -> BP  | 0.158       | 0.073 | 2.171** | 0.016   | Yes       |
| H3c        | ATTLS -> BP  | 0.162       | 0.072 | 2.239** | 0.013   | Yes       |
| H3d        | SPILS -> BP  | 0.401       | 0.055 | 7.259***| 0.000   | Yes       |

Note: **p < .05. *** p < .01.

3.4 Mediating Effect Testing using bootstrapping procedures

The PLS bootstrapping procedures test was used to test how transactional leadership style, transformational leadership style, authentic leadership style, and spiritual leadership style causal effect can be apportioned into business performance through job satisfaction (Hair et al., 2013). Based on 5,000 bootstrap samples, hypothesis H4a (β = 0.134, p < 0.05), H4b (β = 0.157, p < 0.05), H4c (β = 0.159, p < 0.05) and H4d (β = 0.402, p < 0.01) were supported.

Table 3: Result of mediation test using bootstrapping in PLS suggested by Hair et al. (2013) and bootstrapping in SPSS suggested by Hayes (2013)

| Hypothesis | Relationship | Mean of A*B | Standard Error | t value | p Value | Supported |
|------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------|---------|-----------|
| H4a        | TRCLS -> JS -> BP | 0.134 | 0.064 | 2.090** | 0.019 | Yes       |
| H4b        | TRFLS -> JS -> BP | 0.157 | 0.074 | 2.130** | 0.017 | Yes       |
4. Discussion and Conclusion

In summary, this study has demonstrated the applicability of Full Range Leadership Theory (FRLT) in explaining leadership styles effects on employees’ job satisfaction. It is also proved that employees’ job satisfaction play an important role in influencing business performance. This study also evident the significant influence of authentic leadership style and spiritual leadership style on job satisfaction instead of leadership styles that mentioned in FRLT.

In mediation effect, job satisfaction do mediate the effect of transactional leadership style, transformational leadership style, authentic leadership style, and spiritual leadership style on business performance.

4.1 House of pillars Framework for Leadership Styles

Opinion: Development of Talent and Skill Sets is Crucial for Human Capital Development
Figure 2: “House of Pillars Framework for Leadership Styles on Business Performance Mediated by Job Satisfaction”

The new House of Pillars Framework for Leadership Styles as shown in Figure 2 above reflected the structure of this whole study. In the authors’ opinion, it implicates the development of talent and skill sets is crucial for human capital development in an organization before enrolling into the leadership styles. There are also questions raised for future research regarding the relationship between strong business performance and achieving vision and mission such as growth, sustainability and durability for an organization?

4.2 Discussion on the major findings and implication

Overall, transactional leadership styles in this study can be summarized that clear specific terms on who is accountable for what tasks, clear expectations, and express satisfaction will help leaders to reduce number of followers who tend to make mistakes, complaints and failures and deviates from standards.

The finding of transformational leadership style having positive association with job satisfaction through the inspiring and motivating behaviour of transformational leader (Saleem, 2015). Followers are encouraged and motivated to take on more responsibility and autonomy by transformational leaders (Emery & Barker, 2015), thereby it enhance employees’ sense of accomplishment and satisfaction with their job is enhanced.

Organizations need authentic leaders to cope with the new, turbulent and dynamically changing work environment via making a fundamental difference in organizations by aiding employees search meaningfulness and connection at work. Hu and Liden (2011) also suggested group level leadership may facilitate efficient processes, social integration, and smooth communication within the group, enhancing group motivation and potency and, in this way, group effectiveness.

Spiritual leadership style is found to have positive relationship with job satisfaction which consistent with previous study from Fry and Matherly (2006). The purpose of spiritual leadership is to fulfil the fundamental needs of both leader and follower for spiritual survival/well-being and ultimately, to foster higher levels of organizational commitment and productivity (Fry, 2003, 2005).

Monetary rewards, operating condition and benefit reward factors are not really important to determine the job satisfaction of employee but they do care about the supervision they received, the relationship and communication with coworkers. According to Aziri (2011), job satisfaction can be considered as one of the main factors when it comes to efficiency and effectiveness of business organizations. Therefore, organizations that manage to achieve high employee job satisfaction can positively improve their business performance as well.

This study discovered that transactional leadership style could influence business performance positively as supported by a study carried out from Yıldız et al. (2014). Employee would be clear about their goals and rewards and encouraged to meet organizational goals under supervision of a transactional leader, therefore, they could perform accordingly to the expectation of their supervisor without any confusion.

Employee that receive supervision from a transformational leader often felt motivated and improved from time to time because a transformational leader always
working on developing employees’ confident, problem solving skill, ability and talk positively about the future to them. This would be great for human capital development and will leads an organization to be successful.

Authentic leaders promotes transparent, encourage everyone to contribute their thoughts, and also look communication as an important elements. Hence, we could say that organizations may generate other positive effects beside innovativeness, such as organizational performance, organizational commitment, and extra-role performance through having authentic leaders (Müceldili et al., 2013).

Spiritual leadership is a leadership style that consist not only soft leadership criteria such as integrity and consideration on employees, but also some aggressive leadership criteria such as making the work group maximize the output efficiently. There are challenges in implementing spiritual leadership, for example not much leaders could carried out this kind of powerful leadership style and some of the employee might not full accept this kind of leadership style. However, the result of this study is aligned with the findings from Fry and Matherly (2006).

Organization that having transactional or transformational leaders would have favourable employees’ job satisfaction that lead to high business performance. This finding was aligned with previous study from Hartog and Koopman (2002), transactional and transformational leadership styles are positively linked to employee satisfaction and performance, organizational effectiveness, and customer satisfaction. The reason that contribute to the mediation effect of job satisfaction on authentic leadership style and business performance is due to authentic leadership facilitate social integration, efficient processes, and smooth communication within the group, enhancing group motivation and potency, this promotes positive job satisfaction and better business performance. The factor that contribute to the mediation effect of job satisfaction on spiritual leadership style and business performance is due to spiritual leadership involves motivating and inspiring workers through a transcendent vision and a culture based in altruistic values to produce a more motivated, committed and productive workforce. This resulted a positive job satisfaction then lead organization to better business performance.

This study will provide insights on how MNC leaders or supervisors should apply more suitable leadership style or strategy to encourage follower to have greater job satisfaction and ultimately improve the organizations’ business performance. The MNC leaders and supervisors should also improve their knowledge about latest leadership styles and trends or can learn from other successful leader around the world. This will help them in understanding how to improve their leadership style to create better influences on their employees. Leaders and supervisors should act ethical, behavioural and working role models to their employees. Employee will be motivated and willing to commit more on job if their leader could always join them and lead them in the process of achieving organizational goals and milestones. Nevertheless, they should also show respect to their staff and not creating power distance between themselves and employees that will demotivate and ruin the team performance. MNC leaders or supervisors are recommended to adopt a combination in between transactional, transformational, authentic, and spiritual leadership styles to enhance MNC employees’ satisfaction and gain greater business performance. MNC leaders or supervisors should avoid any passive behaviour and spend more time in coaching, focus more on employees’ intrinsic and extrinsic demand, their capabilities, talent development, and provide them an encouraging and supportive environment. MNC leaders and supervisors should continue develop their creativity, team orientation, appreciation of others, coaching and employee recognition as these are useful managerial skills that could help to improve team leading and development.
4.3 Limitations and future study

First, this study is limited in only four types of leadership styles namely transactional, transformational, authentic and spiritual in influencing job satisfaction then lead MNC to better business performance. There might be more leadership styles having influence on job satisfaction and business performance that is ignored by this study, such as, participative, charismatic, situational, stewardship, servant, entrepreneurial and other leadership styles.

Aspects of leaderships were limited to those describe in the construct of the MLQ, ALQ, and SLQ. Job satisfaction was limited to those aspects of job satisfaction recognized within the construction of the JSS instruments. Business performance was limited to the financial and non-financial indicators that adapted in the questionnaire. However, to the researchers understanding, these variables are much more complex and could not be fully understood by only few sets of questionnaires. The use of theory-based instruments limited the participation assessment of variables in the research study.

A first recommendation is to extend the research into a more specific industry and/or a comparison between different industries. Such an investigation can provide evidence and insight to support the inference of the relationship between leadership styles, job satisfaction and business performance in order to allow for better decision to be made during development of human capital for a particular industry.

Second, business environment are ever changing, employees’ needs and the leading methods are always developing and evolving. Study on the effect of more diverse leadership styles, changing environment, and job satisfaction is suggested for future studies and may provide better leadership insights for future leaders.

Third, is to compare the results of the same research study mediated by cross cultural setting from different countries. To what extent work culture of different countries influenced the relationship of leadership styles and business performance. Taking into account that MNCs are globally connected, diverse operations structure, and yet having the ability to influence and connect these employees worldwide.
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