






“Do the qualities of transformational leadership influence employees’ job engagement? A survey of the Indian power sector”

AUTHORS	Anoop Kumar  Shikha Kapoor  Sandeep Kumar Gupta  
ARTICLE INFO	Anoop Kumar, Shikha Kapoor and Sandeep Kumar Gupta (2022). Do the qualities of transformational leadership influence employees’ job engagement? A survey of the Indian power sector. <i>Problems and Perspectives in Management</i> , 20(4), 614-625. doi: 10.21511/ppm.20(4).2022.46
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20(4).2022.46
RELEASED ON	Thursday, 29 December 2022
RECEIVED ON	Saturday, 05 November 2022
ACCEPTED ON	Thursday, 22 December 2022
LICENSE	 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
JOURNAL	"Problems and Perspectives in Management"
ISSN PRINT	1727-7051
ISSN ONLINE	1810-5467
PUBLISHER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”
FOUNDER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

57



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

12

© The author(s) 2023. This publication is an open access article.



BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES



LLC "CPC "Business Perspectives"
Hryhorii Skovoroda lane, 10,
Sumy, 40022, Ukraine
www.businessperspectives.org

Received on: 5th of November, 2022
Accepted on: 22nd of December, 2022
Published on: 29th of December, 2022

© Anoop Kumar, Shikha Kapoor,
Sandeep Kumar Gupta, 2022

Anoop Kumar, MBA, Research Scholar,
Faculty of AIBS, Department of
Management, Amity University Noida,
India.

Shikha Kapoor, Ph.D., Professor,
Faculty of AIBS, Department of
Management, Amity University Noida,
India.

Sandeep Kumar Gupta, Ph.D.,
Professor, AMET Business
School, AMET University, India.
(Corresponding author)



This is an Open Access article,
distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits
unrestricted re-use, distribution, and
reproduction in any medium, provided
the original work is properly cited.

Conflict of interest statement:
Author(s) reported no conflict of interest

Anoop Kumar (India), Shikha Kapoor (India), Sandeep Kumar Gupta (India)

DO THE QUALITIES OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP INFLUENCE EMPLOYEES' JOB ENGAGEMENT? A SURVEY OF THE INDIAN POWER SECTOR

Abstract

The pandemic has put a toll on businesses across the globe, especially power generation as an essential service. The role of leadership is exemplary in driving job engagement in the power sector. The study aims to explore the impact of a leader's inspirational motivation and individualized consideration on employee job engagement in the Indian power sector.

This study is quantitative exploratory research. Using a validated questionnaire, 444 survey responses were taken from executives of major Indian electricity generation utilities. Inspirational motivation and individualized consideration were taken as independent variables, while employee engagement and its components were taken as dependent variables. Statistical methods of simple and multiple correlations were performed using SPSS version 25.

According to the findings, the components of transformational leadership have a positive and significant impact on employee engagement ($r = 0.463$) and its facets of vigor ($r = 0.425$), dedication ($r = 0.455$), and absorption ($r = 0.267$), respectively. In addition, the finding outlines that transformational leaders propagate their high power and enthusiasm to their workers through inspirational motivation to increase their job engagement. The paper also highlights the role of a leader as a coach and mentor through individualized consideration to cater to followers' need for growth and achievement. These findings expand the literature on leadership and employee engagement in the Indian power sector.

Keywords

transformational leadership, employee engagement,
motivation, management, power sector

JEL Classification

D21, D22, D91, L94, M10

INTRODUCTION

Under the effect of the pandemic, organizations are continuously facing challenges in terms of productivity and profits. There is a lot of pressure on organizations to envisage new and innovative methods to align their workforce in a large-scale changing regime. Employee engagement is an indispensable factor in the current business world. On the other side, visionary leadership is inevitable and critical to the growth of any business. Because senior executives have the day-to-day connection and impact over their subordinates, they became the most vital part of the leadership deliberation. Senior leaders can influence their subordinates to stay motivated, increasing their work engagement (Koppula, 2008). Inspirational motivation and idealized influence are other vital factors in the current context. Inspirational motivation is the way of a leader's behavior that motivates the people around them. Leaders create meaning, challenge their co-workers, and encourage them. Individualized consideration is critical and is

directly connected with enhancing employee engagement. Leaders pay attention to individual followers' requirements for growth and achievement. Moreover, they act as coaches and mentors to their followers.

Behavioral science and industrial psychologist researchers are looking for appropriate managerial approaches to increase employee commitment and enthusiasm for their jobs. Nowadays, organizations require leaders who can instill a sense of commitment and zeal in their subordinates using behavioral and personality traits such as charisma and broad vision. This will lead to utilizing their talent and efforts to achieve organizational goals. Such leaders are known as transformational leaders (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Leaders successfully prepare challenging and realistic goals, which increase jobholders' sense of identification, worthiness, and competencies. This study uses inspirational motivation and individualized consideration as independent variables, as they are closely related to employee engagement.

Employee engagement is another variable in this study with its three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor implies a high level of energy and mental resilience in workers during work. A worker has an intended stake in the actual work and feels a high degree of perseverance even if there are challenges (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Another aspect of employee engagement is absorption. This involves concentrating on the work, making elapsed time insignificant, and making it difficult for employees to leave (Gonzalez-Roma et al., 2006; Liorens et al., 2007). Having job experience is enjoyable for individuals. They do it to get it, and rewarding high wages for work is not as crucial as others (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). The third dimension (dedication) is associated with a feeling of importance, inspiration, enthusiasm, challenge, and pride (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004, 2010). This facet manifests itself when an employee deeply takes part in his or her work (Brown, 1996). With the help of three variables, this study attempts to explore the association between transformational leadership and employee engagement.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Jones and Harter (2005) suggested that engagement brings human benefits to the individual who experiences it. The notion of employee engagement has gained traction during pandemic times because it directly predicts job performance (Bakker, 2009; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007). The Indian power sector has a diverse mix of employees, and it has increased manifold during the pandemic. Therefore, leadership becomes more important in dealing with the current context (Sparks et al., 2001). In addition, the transformational leadership styles assist followers in effectively coordinating with one another, which increases their satisfaction level (Shibru, 2011). Many studies have looked at the association between leadership and employee engagement. However, a few explored the linkage between the individual variables of transformational leadership (inspirational motivation and individualized consideration) versus employee engagement (vigor, dedication, and absorption).

According to Bass et al. (2003), four categories represent transformational leadership as a) inspirational motivation, b) idealized influence, c) intellectual stimulation, and d) individualized consideration. Inspirational motivation refers to leaders who paint a clear and positive picture of the future, i.e., vision for their subordinates and encourage them to work toward achieving organizational goals and primary missions. Idealized influence entails projecting an illustrious image while demonstrating wholehearted respect based on self-confidence in the presence of subordinates. The dimension of individualized consideration depicts the leader's recognition of their subordinates and the only way to treat them. In intellectual stimulation, a leader spotlights attaining invention and creativity, as well as using new methods of doing work. According to Atkinson's (1965) motivational theory, motivation is the ability to do work or also to resist doing work. Therefore, aspects of employee engagement, strength and resistance, are addressed, and these concepts are consistent with the definition of motivation (Steers et al., 2004; Latham & Pinder, 2005). Riyanto et al.

(2021) found that employees in the IT industry perform better when motivated, but work satisfaction is unrelated to performance. Although employee engagement does not directly influence performance, it can significantly affect performance when it acts as a mediator through motivation and job satisfaction.

Bass (1999) was a leading researcher in leadership studies who classified leaders as transformational and transactional. The author proposed that “transformational leaders demonstrated superior leadership performance” when they plead to uplift the inner-being of their followers to inspire them and to pursue their discrete self-interest for the bigger goal. Avolio et al. (1999) proposed another definition of transformational leadership. The study defined transformational leaders as influential and charismatic in their power to motivate employees to go above and beyond what was expected of them at work. Focusing on Bass’s conceptualization of leadership, Al-Swidi et al. (2012) outlined that transformational leadership positively influences employee behavior. With these qualities, transformational leaders motivate employees to achieve increased productivity, enhanced service delivery, and problem-solving (Spector, 2004). Burns (1978) also considered the notion of a transformational leader. Bass (2003) was another researcher who worked profoundly on the subject.

Similarly, Seltzer and Bass (1990) highlighted that transformational leaders inspire and encourage their juniors to use new problem-solving methods. Literature highlights that many attributes, e.g., influential, charismatic, trustworthy, inspirational, confident, motivating, world-class, exciting, considerate, and powerful, have been used to describe transformational leaders (Bass et al., 1987; Bass, 1985). Some studies have also found an association between transformational leadership vs. job satisfaction (Pillai et al., 1999), organizational effectiveness (Moore, 2008), job motivation (Macey & Schneider, 2008), withdrawal behavior (Walumbwa, 2005), turnover (Chan & Drasgow, 2001), and job performance (Bass et al., 2003). Kumar et al. (2022) explained satisfaction with the life of employees through employee engagement. The authors

have used different control variables and job satisfaction to explain life satisfaction while controlling for employee engagement.

Valldeneu et al. (2021) suggest that managers and leaders who want to see their employees work harder and become more engaged should employ transformational behaviors. To spur widespread engagement, they should strengthen transformational behaviors like being open and consistent and having a clear sense of purpose. Xanthopoulou et al. (2007) showed that resources such as ‘quality coaching’ contribute to employee engagement. Hayati et al. (2014) conducted a survey study on government hospital nurses showing a relationship between transformational leadership and their work engagement. In a similar vein, Zhu et al. (2009) conducted a study on the linkage between transformational leadership and employee engagement. All the quoted researchers proposed and demonstrated a link between transformational leadership and employee engagement, especially when a worker is creative and innovative. However, most of the leading research concentrated on the organizational consequences corresponding to specific leadership approaches like efficiency or performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Harter et al., 2002). In an investigation of the Indian IT sector, Renu et al. (2021) found a significant connection between HR practices and corporate image building, which the leaders strive for.

According to Macey and Schneider (2008), employee engagement is the energy a worker devotes to his or her work. A worker also earns efficiency and effectiveness from that work (Maslach et al., 2001). Dedication shares many characteristics with work involvement. This is defined as the degree of connection and identity with the work. Earlier research has found that autonomy (Bakker, 2009) and self-efficacy are essential antecedents of employee engagement due to their inspiring potential (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). According to the definition by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), “employee engagement can also be seen as a fluctuating state within the person.” According to Brown (1996), employee engagement is related to high productivity and meeting customers’ needs and desires. The literature review also elaborates on anteced-

ents of employee engagement, which include social, physical, and mental attributes of the job (Bakker et al., 2005), job stress (Demerouti et al., 2001), training and autonomy at work (Bakker et al., 2007), and work-family frictions (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Yıldız and Özcan (2014) established a conclusive relationship between transformational leadership and subordinate creativity. Gîrneață and Potcovaru (2015) outlined that leadership in any organization has a heavy influence on the culture. Out of various definitions of employee engagement, the most common is given by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004), “positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor (feeling energetic and resilience at work), dedication (being proud of and happy about one’s work) and absorption (being immersed in one’s work).”

2. AIM AND HYPOTHESES

The goal of this study is to investigate the inter and intra- relationships between the two variables of transformational leadership and employee engagement. This study will evaluate four main hypotheses, H_{01} , H_{02} , H_{03} , and H_{04} . In addition, hypothesis H_{01} has three sub-hypotheses, H_{011} , H_{012} , and H_{013} .

H_{01} : *There is a significant relationship between transformational leadership and employee engagement.*

H_{011} : *There is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and vigor.*

H_{012} : *There is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and dedication.*

H_{013} : *There is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and absorption.*

H_{02} : *Inspirational motivation and individualized consideration are predictors of vigor.*

H_{03} : *Inspirational motivation and individualized consideration are predictors of dedication.*

H_{04} : *Inspirational motivation and individualized consideration are predictors of absorption.*

3. METHODOLOGY

Participants in this study were drawn from one of the significant electricity-generating utilities of India. The utility is the single largest public sector organization contributing to approx. 24% of total India’s power generating capacity. This utility was also placed on the list of Forbes Global-2000 in the year 2018. Currently, the organization employs over 18,000 workforces posted in more than 50 plants and offices across India. The company is also known for its best human resource practices and is in the complete value chain of power generation. A convenient sampling method is used for collecting the data.

The questionnaire for two components – inspirational motivation (IM) and individualized consideration (IC) – was assessed using a multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 1997). The transformational leadership questionnaire (TLQ) is a part of MLQ, which gauges the transactional and transformational leadership styles. However, the study only used the transformational one in this study and further for two variables only. This includes six questions total, three questions each for inspirational motivation and individual consideration. Bass and Avolio (1997) reported its reliability range of 0.81 to 0.94 based on 14 studies covering various areas like military, financial, industrial, and medical occupations.

The construct of employee engagement (EE) is measured using the 15-item revised short version of the Utrecht work engagement scale developed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004). This scale evaluates the three underlying facets of employee engagement: a) vigor (5 items), b) dedication (5 items), and c) absorption (5 items). In addition, a 5-point Likert scale was used for perception questions, with endpoints of never (equals 1) and always (equals 5).

4. RESULTS

The data collected were further analyzed using SPSS version 25. Cronbach’s alpha was 0.73 for overall reliability. The internal correlation between vigor, dedication, and absorption was reported to be 0.78, 0.91, and 0.73, respectively.

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for demographic variables. The sample size is 444, consisting of executives from different functional areas and grades. The sample represents a good mix of employees working in rural and urban areas where projects are located. First, 81 female and 364 male employees participated in the survey. The average length of employee service is 15 years, and an employee was posted to more than 2 locations in his/her tenure. Third, 23.2% of employees work shift duties, while 76.8% work general day shifts. The average age of respondents is 40 years; 54.5% of employees are graduates, while more than 37% are PG and above. Mean and standard deviations are also shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic profile of respondents

Descriptive Statistics	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	%
Urban/Remote workplace	0.84	0.371	N = 444	
Urban			72	16.22%
Remote			372	83.78%
Service length (years)	15.01	10.399		
No. of postings in total tenure	2.59	1.595		
Shift and day working	0.77	0.423		
Shift working			103	23.20%
Day shift			341	76.80%
Employee age (years)	40.07	10.567		
Gender (Male or Female)	0.18	0.385		
Male			363	81.76%
Female			81	18.24%
Educational qualification (Undergraduate/ Graduate/Postgraduate and above)	2.30	0.609		
UG			36	8.11%
Graduate			242	54.50%
PG and above			166	37.39%

Cronbach’s alpha is calculated for all the variables. Table 2 shows that all the variables are well above 0.7, indicating the assessment scales’ reliability.

Table 3. Means, SDs and correlations

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	TL	IM	IC	EE	V	D	A
Transformational leadership (TL)	3.7845	0.66976	1.000	0.905	0.897	0.463	0.425	0.455	0.267
Inspirational motivation (IM)	3.7770	0.72788		1.000	0.665	0.433	0.389	0.411	0.273
Individualized consideration (IC)	3.7553	0.71190			1.000	0.416	0.387	0.422	0.225
Employee engagement (EE)	3.7350	0.68997				1.000	0.841	0.813	0.809
Vigor (V)	3.6779	0.78804					1.000	0.572	0.527
Dedication (D)	3.8365	0.84470						1.000	0.435
Absorption (A)	3.6905	0.89089							1.000

Note: ** p < .01.

Reliability statistics state that scales are consistent and error-free. Therefore, for determining the consistency and reliability of an instrument, Cronbach’s alpha should be less than 0.6 at least and considered much more reliable when more than 0.70 (Nunnally et al., 1994).

Table 2. Reliability statistics

	N = 444	Cronbach’s alpha
Vigor		0.860
Dedication		0.863
Absorption		0.883
Employee engagement		0.839
Inspirational motivation		0.866
Individualized consideration		0.867
Transformational leadership		0.856
Overall Cronbach’s alpha (7 items)		0.880

Table 3 displays mean, standard deviations, and simple correlations between the study variables. According to Table 3, transformational leadership (TL) positively correlates with employee engagement (EE) with r = 0.463.

Therefore, the main hypothesis H₀₁ is accepted. In addition, a good correlation is found between transformational leadership and components of employee engagement, i.e., a) vigor (r = 0.425), b) dedication (r = 0.455), and c) absorption (r = 0.267), respectively. This is also supporting sub-hypotheses H₀₁₁, H₀₁₂, and H₀₁₃. All these relationships are confirmed at the significance level of p ≤ 0.01.

To test hypothesis H₀₂, the study runs multiple regression with independent variables inspirational motivation (IM) and individualized consideration (IC), keeping the dependent variable of vigor (V). The results are shown in Tables 4-6.

Table 4. Model summary for H₀₂

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. An error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.425 ^a	0.181	0.177	0.71488	0.181	48.651	2	441	0.000

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), IC, IM.

Table 5. ANOVA^a for H₀₂

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	49.727	2	24.864	48.651	.000b
	Residual	225.376	441	0.511		
	Total	275.104	443			

Note: a. Dependent Variable: Vigor, b. Predictors: (Constant), IC, IM.

Table 6. Coefficients^a for H₀₂

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		1	(Constant)	1.757			0.198	
	IM	0.256	0.062	0.236	4.093	0.000	0.133	0.379
	IC	0.254	0.064	0.230	3.980	0.000	0.129	0.380

Note: a. Dependent Variable: Vigor.

Accordingly, the variables IM and IC are significantly predicting vigor (V) [F(2,441) = 48.651, p < 0.001, R² = 0.181]. Two aspects of transformational leadership account for approximately 18% of vigor. Furthermore, the results show that IM (β = 0.236) and IC (β = 0.230) have almost equal contributions in explaining the variation in vigor. These results support H₀₂.

For testing H₀₃, multiple regression was run with independent variables as (IM) and (IC) with the dependent variable as the dedication (D). The results are shown in Tables 7-9.

The results predict that IM and IC are statistically and significantly predicting the dedication (D) [MR = 0.456, F (2,441) = 58.032, p < 0.001, R² = 0.208]. Together, these dimensions (IM and IC) predict 20.8% of the dependent variable (dedication). It is also noticed that individualized consideration (β = 0.267) is a better predictor of dedication, which also supports the literature review. Thus, H₀₃ is also confirmed.

For testing H₀₄, Tables 10-12 show the results of multiple regressions analysis between independent variables IM and IC and the dependent variable of absorption (A).

Table 7. Model summary for H₀₃

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. An error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.456 ^a	0.208	0.205	0.75327	0.208	58.032	2	441	0.000

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), IC, IM.

Table 8. ANOVA^a for H₀₃

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	65.857	2	32.928	58.032	.000b
	Residual	250.232	441	0.567		
	Total	316.089	443			

Note: a. Dependent Variable: Dedication. b. Predictors: (Constant), IC, IM.

Table 9. Coefficients^a for H₀₃

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.625	0.208		7.801	0.000	1.216	2.035
	IM	0.270	0.066	0.233	4.103	0.000	0.141	0.400
	IC	0.317	0.067	0.267	4.710	0.000	0.185	0.449

Note: a. Dependent Variable: Dedication.

Table 10. Model summary for H₀₄

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. An error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.279 ^a	0.078	0.074	0.85739	0.078	18.645	2	441	0.000

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), IC, IM.

Table 11. ANOVA^a for H₀₄

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27.413	2	13.706	18.645	.000 ^b
	Residual	324.188	441	0.735		
	Total	351.600	443			

Note: a. Dependent Variable: Absorption, b. Predictors: (Constant), IC, IM.

Table 12. Coefficients^a for H₀₄

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.302	0.237		9.709	0.000	1.836	2.768
	IM	0.272	0.075	0.222	3.628	0.000	0.125	0.419
	IC	0.096	0.077	0.077	1.256	0.210	-0.054	0.247

Note: a. Dependent Variable: Absorption.

According to the results shown, the variables IM and IC are statistically predicting the absorption (A) [F (2,441) = 18.645, p < 0.001, R² = 0.078]. However, it is a weak prediction. The component inspirational motivation (IM) is the only strong predictor ($\beta = 0.222$) in explaining absorption variance, while individualized consideration (IC) does not contribute to predicting absorption ($\beta = 0.077$, p < 0.21). Therefore, this hypothesis is partially supported.

5. DISCUSSION

According to the findings of this study, two components of transformational leadership have a significant positive association with employee engagement and its three variables. The combination of the research variables taken for the

study also provided cognizance of the potential linkage between transformational leadership and work engagement. The study found a relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Furthermore, multiple regression results revealed that transformational leadership components, particularly inspirational motivation, explain a significant variance in work engagement dimensions.

As per the literature review, the leadership measures and conceptualization given by Bass (1985a, 1985b) were based on transactional and transformational leadership theories. The literature review also suggested that transformational leadership is most likely a predictive characteristic of a distinguished leader. Therefore, only transformational leadership was investigated under the objectives of this study. Bass (1985a, 1985b) de-

findings that those workers feel likely to put in an additional effort at their work when they report to leaders who inspire and stimulate their workers, i.e., transformational leaders. According to Avolio et al. (1999), transformational leaders exhibited appealing and magnetic characteristics in their ability to motivate workers to go above and beyond what was expected from them at work. The findings also support Pillai et al. (1999), Chan and Drasgow (2001), and Moore (2008), who found a significant relationship between transformational leadership and different organizational variables.

Furthermore, May et al. (2004) outlined that psychological safety increases employee engagement. Psychological safety may be a sense of self-expression without fearing pessimistic outcomes. The study further adds that supportive and directive leadership can increase psychological safety. Transformational leaders set different performance criteria and standards for their employees without using aggressive or criticized judgment. Individual consideration compels leaders to consider employees' needs, desires, and aspirations. Therefore, transformational leaders with individual motivation and consideration can set up an appropriate environment, thereby ensuring psychological safety. In this safe environment, workers can freely express their opinions and make suggestions. Harter et al. (2003) also considered this desirable contributory climate in the workplace to increase engagement, involvement, and employee commitment.

Transformational leaders can increase employee engagement by enhancing employees' dependency and control, as well as encouraging them to confront and overcome new challenges. Lee and Brand (2005) define control as the amount of dominance in the workplace regarding time and work style. The concept of control is derived from the job characteristics model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Thus, five job characteristics (task identity, skill variety, feedback, task significance, and authority) are essential in increasing work motivation. Furthermore, such inspirational leaders enhance employees' success potential by encouraging their creative thinking. This infuses essential power and energy into employees and increases employee engagement (Terry et al., 2000). Therefore, transformational leaders instill a feeling of self-worth, self-motivation, achievement, and success in their followers (Shamir et al., 1993).

According to Brief and Weiss (2002), transformational leaders model their eagerness and power for their employees. Therefore, this method can enhance workers' power as an element of employee engagement. In addition, employees may form a specific belief toward these leaders because of their idealized influence. Consequently, employees identify themselves with the leaders and align with their objectives and expectations. As a result, inspirational motivation is transmitted to them by their leaders. Finally, a positive vision is created in workers, who internally set high standards and challenges for themselves, which drives optimism in pursuing success in the workplace.

CONCLUSION

The primary objective of this study was to explore the inter and intra-relationships between transformational leadership and employee engagement. According to the findings, the components of transformational leadership have a positive and significant impact on employee engagement ($r = 0.463$). Furthermore, leadership also has a positive association with the facets of employee engagement, i.e., vigor ($r = 0.425$), dedication ($r = 0.455$), and absorption ($r = 0.267$), respectively.

The study finding outlines that transformational leader propagates their high power and enthusiasm to their workers through inspirational motivation to increase their engagement on the job.

This paper is the first of its kind in the Indian power sector to investigate how some components of transformational leadership influence employee engagement and its variables. More than the focus on magnitudes of relationships, the current study adds value to research by elucidating the psychological aspects (vigor, dedication, and absorption) that underpin the relationship between trans-

formational leadership and employee engagement. The analysis also highlights the role of a leader as a coach and mentor through individualized consideration to cater to followers' need for growth and achievement. The findings expand the literature on leadership and employee engagement in the Indian power sector.

The study shows that fluctuations in components of transformational leadership can impact employees' engagement in work individually or as a whole. For example, when a supervisor uses transformational leadership to boost his/her worker's optimism, a worker becomes more engaged. The results showed that transformational leadership aspects and dedication are significantly positive ($MR = 0.456$, $F = 58.032$, $P \leq 0.001$). The individualized consideration ($\beta = 0.27$) has the most driving factor when depicting the measure of dedication of the sector employees. Furthermore, it can be stated that improvement in transformational leadership abilities helps to increase workers' performance by positively influencing their engagement. This is directly resulting in productivity and performance benefits to the organization.

With the help of these research outcomes, many suggestions can be outlined to help organizations improve their leadership effectiveness. First, organizations must develop a mechanism for managers and leaders that can bridge the gap between the existing and ideal leadership qualities. This will help to develop dynamic and effective leadership behavior.

The human resource wing of the industries that work for different planned and unplanned interventions for leadership development must understand that these managers and leaders come from different socio-cultural backgrounds and have different work exposures and experiences. They also have different stages of personal development with different preferences for leadership styles. In addition, existing leaders have different psychological factors like desires, motivations, tolerances, and abilities. HR leaders must recognize these differences to draft a solid foundation for leadership development with individual mapping. Great organizations in the power sector have started coaching facilities for their future leaders, thereby supplementing formal training with mentorship programs so that leaders will get continuous feedback on their behaviors. Provided that power generation is a sensitive and essential service for a country like India, organizational leaders require a high level of inbuilt traits of inspirational motivation with individualized consideration for employees. Therefore, transformational leadership may improve work engagement and overall productivity in India's power sector.

Future research can focus on other variables like personality or psychological traits to yield better and more effective outcomes than general results. This sector-specific research can be extended to other sectors for better interpretation and correlations. Different moderators like gender, income group, and family status can also be studied to find their effect on this relationship. This will help to investigate significant results for improvement in organizational outcomes.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Anoop Kumar.

Data curation: Anoop Kumar.

Formal analysis: Sandeep Kumar Gupta, Shikha Kapoor.

Investigation: Anoop Kumar.

Methodology: Anoop Kumar.

Project administration: Sandeep Kumar Gupta.

Resources: Sandeep Kumar Gupta.

Supervision: Sandeep Kumar Gupta, Shikha Kapoor

Writing – original draft: Sandeep Kumar Gupta, Anoop Kumar, Shikha Kapoor.

Writing – review & editing: Sandeep Kumar Gupta, Anoop Kumar, Shikha Kapoor.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Swidi, A. K., Nawawi, M. M., & Al-Hosam, A. (2012). Is the relationship between employees' psychological empowerment and employees' job satisfaction contingent on transformational leadership? A study on the Yemeni Islamic Banks. *Asian Social Science*, 8(10), 130-150. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n10p130>
2. Atkinson, J. W. (1965). The main spring of achievement-oriented activity. In J. D. Krumboltz (Ed.), *Learning and the education process*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
3. Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational leadership and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-462. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789>
4. Bakker, A. (2009). Building engagement in the workplace. In C. Cooper & R. Burke (Eds.), *The peak performing organization* (pp. 50-72). London: Routledge.
5. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
6. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(2), 170-180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.170>
7. Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work organisation when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 274-284. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.274>
8. Bass, B. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410>
9. Bass, B. M. (1985a). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(3), 26-40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(85\)90028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2)
10. Bass, B. M. (1985b). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
11. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full range leadership development: A manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, USA: Mind Garden Inc.
12. Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and the assessment of transformational leadership at the world-class level. *Journal of Management*, 13(1), 7-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638701300102>
13. Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207>
14. Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279-307. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135156>
15. Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120(2), 235-255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.120.2.235>
16. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
17. Chan, K., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership. *Journal of Academy of Management*, 86(3), 487-498. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.481>
18. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
19. Gîrneată, A., & Potcovaru, M. (2015). The influence of organizational culture in increasing the performance of textile and clothing companies. *The 4th Multidisciplinary Academic Conference*. Prague, Czech Republic.
20. Gonzalez-Roma, V., Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Lioret, S. (2006). Burnout and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(1), 165-174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.01.003>
21. Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258214>
22. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)
23. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>
24. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. (2003). Well-being in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 766-772.
25. Hayati, D., Charkhabi, M., & Naami, A. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership and work engagement in governmental hospitals nurses: A survey study. *SpringerPlus*, 3, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-3-25>
26. Howell, J. M., & Avolio, A. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control,

- and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.6.891>
27. Jones, J. R., & Harter, J. K. (2005). Race effects on the employee engagement-turnover intention relationship. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 11(2), 78-88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190501100208>
 28. Koppula, R. (2008). *Examining the relationship between transformational leadership and engagement* (Master's Thesis). San Jose State University.
 29. Kumar, A., Kapoor, S., & Narula, V. (2022). Coping with Covid: An effect of employee engagement on satisfaction with life in the power sector of India. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(4). Retrieved from <https://journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/3982>
 30. Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 485-516. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142105>
 31. Lee, S., & Brand, G. (2005). Effects of control over office workspace on the perception of the work outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25(3), 323-333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.08.001>
 32. Liorens, S., Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A., & Salanova, M. (2007). Does a positive gain spiral of resources, efficacy beliefs and engagement exist? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(1), 825-841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.11.012>
 33. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x>
 34. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
 35. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. (2004). The psychological condition of meaning fullness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892>
 36. Moore, J. K. (2008). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Science*, 5, 5-16.
 37. Nunnally, J. C., Bernstein, I. H., & Berge, J. M. T. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
 38. Pillai, R., Schrieshem, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perception and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897-933. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500606>
 39. Rana, R., Kapoor, S., & Gupta, S. K. (2021). Impact of HR practices on corporate image building in the Indian IT sector. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(2), 528-535. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19\(2\).2021.42](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(2).2021.42)
 40. Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(3), 162-174. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19\(3\).2021.14](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(3).2021.14)
 41. Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (2008). *Essential of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
 42. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
 43. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10-24). New York: Psychology Press.
 44. Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. (2007). Work engagement: An emerging psychological concept and its implications for organizations. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research in social issues in management: Managing social and ethical issues in organizations* (pp. 135-177). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers.
 45. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: a two-sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
 46. Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management*, 16(4), 693-703. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639001600403>
 47. Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Artur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 4, 577-594. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.4.4.577>
 48. Shibru, B. (2011). Transformational leadership and its relationship with subordinate satisfaction with the leader (The case of the leather industry in Ethiopia). *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(5), 686-697. Retrieved from <https://journal-archives8.webs.com/686-697.pdf>
 49. Sparks, K., Faragher, B., & Cooper, C. L. (2001). Well-being and occupational health in the 21st-century workplace. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 489-509. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317901167497>
 50. Spector, P. E. (2004). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice*. New York: John Wiley.
 51. Steers, R. M., Porter, L. W., & Bigley, G. A. (2004). *Motivation*

- and leadership of work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
52. Terry, P. C., Carron, A. V., Pink, M. J., Lane, A. M., Jones, G. J., & Hall, M. P. (2000). Perception of group cohesion and mood in sports teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4(3), 244-253. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.4.3.244>
 53. Valldeneu, M., Ferràs, X., & Tarrats-Pons, E. (2021). Transformational behaviors: Increasing work engagement in multinational environments. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(2), 519-527.
 54. Walumbwa, F. (2005). The relationship between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 612-620. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19\(2\).2021.41](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(2).2021.41)
 55. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 121-141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121>
 56. Yıldız, M. L., & Özcan, E. D. (2014). Organizational climate as a moderator of the relationship between transformational leadership and creativity. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 2(1), 76-87.
 57. Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Moderating role of follower characteristics with transformational leadership and follower work engagement. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(5), 590-619. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601108331242>