

The Measurements of Follower Performance in aspects of Leadership, Personality, Leader-Member Exchange, and Trustworthiness

Roy Setiawan

Universitas Kristen Petra, Indonesia
Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2934-7983

ABSTRACT

This research will discuss the concept of Follower Performance in aspects of Leadership, Personality, Leader-Member Exchange, and Trustworthiness, along with its measurement indicators. This study aims to enrich the study of organizational behavior and contribute to other researchers to develop related studies that use these measurement indicators. This article is a concept review presented systematically.

Keywords: Follower Performance, Leadership, Personality, Leader-Member Exchange, Trustworthiness.

Correspondence Author: Roy Setiawan

Universitas Kristen Petra, Indonesia
Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia
roy@petra.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Success in today's competitive global environment encourages organizations to maximize followers' performance, which is a set of actions and behaviors relevant from followers to achieve organizational goals (Campbell, 1990). The increase in followers performance will contribute to the achievement of goals and organizational performance. This is a shared responsibility between leaders and followers, especially in human resource management, which has the main output to produce high-performance followers by identifying, measuring, and developing performance. Organizations spend time, energy, and funds to initiate performance management to influence followers' behavior to achieve organizational goals (Wathall and Dent, 2016; Ribeiro, Yu cel, Gomes, 2018).

Followers performance is the overall goal achieved by certain employees (Griffin, 2004), including individual behavior relevant to the production process (Hughes et al., 2008). Followers performance is essential because it will create an overall organizational performance (Barberoglu and Secim, 2015). Followers performance is a collective result of the abilities and efforts of followers to achieve organizational targets. Followers are defined as follower activities to fulfill obligations towards achieving organizational goals and objectives (Kocak, 2006). Schermerhorn (2000) argues that when quality or productivity is high, overall organizational performance efficiency will also increase (Zefeiti, Mohammad, 2017).

This article aims to discuss the concept of followers performance and its measurement in terms of leadership, personality, leader-member exchange, and trustworthiness, considering that recent research on this subject is very limited.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Followers Performance

Chaleff (2009) states that the concept of followers

(follower) and subordinates (subordinates) is different. A subsidiary is someone who reports his work to someone who has a higher position. While followers (follower) share the same goals with the leader, believe in the organization's efforts to achieve the best, and work passionately to reach the final destination.

Influential followers (followers) will influence organizational performance and do not rely entirely on leadership all the time. Leader's influence on the organization is around 10% to 20%, while follower effectiveness contributes significantly to 80% - 90% of success. Without followers, only a few can be cultivated (Kelley, 1992). Good organizational performance requires good leadership. Good leaders need influential followers (Banutu and Gomez in Pitron, 2007).

Yukl (2010) mentions the tendency to associate organizational success with the leader's role and obscure the part of followers. The condition of competent and motivated participants is essential for the success of task implementation and the achievement of a unit's goals or a group headed by a leader. The role of followers who have not received full attention is also conveyed by researchers such as Kelley (1992). Bjugstad and Spotlight (2007), Pitron (2008), Kellerman (2008), and Chaleff (2009).

According to Sulistyowati (2016), research conducted by Bjugstad and Spotlight (2006) cites book research conducted by Amazon.com that there are 95,220 book titles related to leadership, while 792 titles are linked to followership (or one hundred and twenty to one). According to Bjugstad and Spotlight (2007), this is ironic considering that leadership and followership are two things that are interrelated with one another. The irony that this means is that: (a) the word followership is still considered a stigma; (b) followership often has negative and positive connotations, weak and confronting; (c) followership is a form of "devaluation" and connotes a negative image; (d) the emergence of an incorrect

The Measurements of Follower Performance in aspects of Leadership, Personality, Leader-Member Exchange, and Trustworthiness

conception that leaders are more important than followers. titles for leadership books and 162 titles for accounting books (or four hundred and twelve to one), while Barnes and Noble publishers have 28,391 titles for leadership books and 12 markers for follow-up books (or two thousand three hundred and sixty-five to one).

Followers performance can be seen in two categories, namely task performance, and contextual performance. Task performance refers to behavior that is directly related to the organization's function or technical work (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; M Shariff et al., 2020), which is also called in-role behavior (Brandes, Dharwadkar, and Wheatley, 2004). Meanwhile, contextual performance is a measure of behavior that is not directly related to functional or technical work processes, but rather to social, organizational, and psychological support provided by followers to the organization (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994) such as job dedication (initiative, persistence) and interpersonal facilitation or cooperative behavior (Michael, Harris, Giles, and Field, 2005; Muhammad et al., 2019; Munir et al., 2019) as well as OCB (Wayne et al., 1997; Noreen et al., 2019; Noorollahi et al., 2019).

The literature shows very much how followers' performance is defined and measured, from general things to particular behaviors such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Wayne and Green, 1993), post-training skill transfer, innovative work behavior (IWB). (Agarwal, Datta, Blake-Beard, and Bhargava, 2011), supervisor rated performance (Grodzicki and Varma, 2011), peer-rated performance (Zhang, Waldman, and Wang, 2012), and self-rated performance (Golden and Veiga, 2008; Normalini et al., 2019; Ramakrishnan et al., 2020). OCB and IWB are examples of behavioral measures used in various industries and types of work (Wathall and Dent, 2016; Shabbir et al., 2019). Still, followers' performance is often measured by task performance or job performance (Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrack, 2002).

Pitron (2008) states that to become an effective follower or what is called an "organizational performer," the attributes that make up follower performance are: (1) thinking for himself; (2) doing work beyond what is expected; (3) support groups and leaders; (4) goal-oriented; (5) doing critical things related to the achievement of goals; (6) taking the initiative to increase benefits for the organization; (7) understands that he can provide benefits with his contributions, experiences, and ideas; (8) managing daily activities and work; (9) see clearly how the work itself is related to the organization; (10) position oneself as an essential part in achieving goals. (11) believe that the tasks performed are critical; (12) check the progress of work periodically; (13) increasing awareness in the crucial path area of achieving goals; (14) develop additional capabilities that are beneficial to the organization; (15) strive for new ideas.

Meanwhile, Gilbert and Hyde's (1988) research explains the follower performance aspects of (1) partnerships with leaders; (2) motivation; (3) competence; (4) a sense of humor; (5) willingness to carry out and follow what has been determined; (6) a positive working relationship; (7) courage to speak; (8) courtesy. Landino (2008) states that follower performance is formed through (1) skill-based components which include professionalism, interpersonal communication skills, and conflict orientation, which can be developed through training methods; (2) character-based features include

intelligence, initiative, and integrity whose development can be done through experiences that must be faced by followers.

Suppose followers are an important source of organizational competitive advantage. In that case, the leader must manage them effectively to become a crucial differentiator for organizational success. It is interesting to research further considering that the concept of performance tends to be only associated with subordinates, job performances, and the like. Not many recent studies have reviewed the aspects of task performance and contextual performance together.

Followers' performance is also influenced by various factors, including transformational leadership and leaders' personality, which will shape leader followers' relationship patterns (leader-member exchanges) to create trustworthiness. The purpose of this study was to determine the leadership patterns and relationships of follower leaders on follower performance (Gottfredson, Aguinis, 2017; Wathall and Dent, 2016; Ribeiro, Yucel, Gomes, 2018).

Leadership

The strong relationship between leaders and followers is usually determined mainly by leadership effectiveness. One of the most important factors that build this bond is transformational leadership (Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005). Transformational leadership is made from various constructs consisting of individualized influence behavior, intellectual stimulation, idealized influence, and inspirational motivation (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1997; Bass, 1985). The behavior of a transformational leader will create quality relationships with followers individually. Then followers are expected to reciprocate this social exchange relationship by exerting all efforts, strength, and encouragement for the leader (Deluga, 1992). In line with this view, several empirical studies have reported a positive relationship between transformational leadership behavior and the quality of the Leader Members Exchange (LMX) ((Basu & Green, 1997; Deluga, 1992; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Li & Hung, 2009; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Wang et al., 2005).

Transformational leaders demonstrate high ethical and moral standards, pay attention to followers' feelings and needs personally, and do not publicly criticize followers (Avoilo & Bass, 2004; Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Kearney & Gebert, 2009; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Therefore followers feel appreciated and safe so that a positive relationship is built, which will create trust in the leader (trustworthiness) and high performance performance (followers' performance).

Some researchers label idealized influence and inspirational motivation as second-order factors because they show the essence of transformational leadership. Idealized influence / inspirational motivation refers to how leaders provide an attractive and motivating future vision that challenges and energizes followers and makes leaders role models (Avolio and Bass, 2002). Intellectual stimulation refers to the leader's ability to encourage followers to make decisions in creative ways. Meanwhile, individualized consideration is the behavior of a leader who sees followers personally, not only as group members, but as subordinates, but as a complete human being. This behavior will position the leader as a coach and mentor by providing delegation and learning opportunities to succeed and experience failure without leaving followers. Also, individualized consideration

The Measurements of Follower Performance in aspects of Leadership, Personality, Leader-Member Exchange, and Trustworthiness

behavior will give followers a higher level of performance by paying attention to their personal needs and providing an appreciation for each achievement achieved (Bass, 1985; Avolio et al., 1999; Avolio and Bass, 2002).

Personality

There is very little empirical evidence linking personality attributes and LMX (Phillips and Bedeian, 1994). The study of the relationship between personality and LMX is significant because first, it is still limited to differences in demographic characteristics (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Barry and Stewart, 1997; Bauer and Green, 1996; Deluga, 1998; McClane, 1991; Phillips and Bedeian, 1994; Smith and Canger, 2004). Second, it is necessary to know what types of persons can produce consistent behavior towards positive LMX (Bernerth, Armenakis, Field, Giles, Walker, 2007).

The LMX approach to leadership is unique, and previous evidence has often focused only on LMX followers (Dulebohn et al., 2012). But in fact, personality and similarities have an enormous influence on differences in LMX perceptions between leaders and followers and have different impacts (Schyns, 2015). One of them is the Big Five Personality concept, which has implications for LMX (Yoon, Bono, 2016). Here are the measurements of the Big Five Personality:

1. Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness is associated with dependable, responsible, hard-working, self-disciplined, persistent, playful, and organized behavior (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Conscientiousness prevents a person from deviating behavior that causes errors in completing tasks (Barry and Stewart, 1997). Conscientiousness was a predictor of excellent performance outcomes (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Barrick et al., 2001). The results showed that follower performance was positively related to the leader's perceptions of followers who would make followers feel supported with this typical leader personality (Bauer and Green, 1996; Deluga and Perry, 1994). In social exchange theory, someone who receives support from their leader will create feelings of indebtedness individually, so that followers will pay for it with loyal behavior, vigorous effort, and other positive actions (Blau, 1964). Leaders with a high level of conscientiousness will care about the performance and efforts made by followers (Bernerth, Armenakis, Field, Giles, Walker, 2007).

2. Extraversion

Someone with high extraversion looks attractive in social relationships, gregarious, assertive, expressive, feels comfortable in groups, and has lots of friends ((Costa and McCrae, 1988; Watson and Clark, 1997). Extraversion tends to see positive experiences of life events and is more likely to find satisfaction in interpersonal interactions (Watson and Clark, 1997). Meanwhile, introverts tend to be introspective and self-occupied (Watson and Clark, 1997) or more quiet and independent (Costa and McCrae, 1992).

Extraversion is closely related to leadership in social relationships with followers and determines the quality of the LMX ((Costa and McCrae, 1988; Watson and Clark, 1997). Extraversion will make leaders more effective (Judge et al. 2002) and make themselves transformational leaders. (Judge and Bono, 2000) They have a sense of trust and respect for followers so that

followers dare to ask for input to improve performance (Bernerth, Armenakis, Field, Giles, Walker, 2007). The basis of the LMX concept is an exchange of respect and trust between leaders. And followers (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Graen, 1976).

3. Agreeableness

Agreeableness is an essential factor for forming reciprocal social alliances (Buss, 1991). A person with a high level of agreeableness will have great motivation to build intimate interpersonal relationships (Judge et al., 2002). Agreeableness is characterized by cooperative behavior, thoughtful attitude, politeness, sensitivity, kindness, respect, cheerful, and caring. Besides, leaders who agreeableness will more prioritize the interests of others and will not hesitate to help (Costa and McCrae, 1992), encourage followers to cooperate, share information, do not emphasize differences in status and power, and have a close relationship with followers (Heller et al., 2002). Agreeableness is positively related to LMX (Dockery and Steiner, 1990; Wayne and Ferris, 1990). In the concept of social exchange, followers who have such a leader will feel guilty if they do not repay the leader's kindness (Blau, 1964).

4. Openness To Experience

Openness is characterized by high imagination, curiosity, a broad mind, and creativity (Barrick and Mount, 1991). An open person will be able to think "outside of the box," question assumptions, stimulate new perspectives (Costa and McCrae, 1988; Judge and Bono, 2000). In the LMX context, this kind of relationship will challenge each other to think critically. In the concept of social exchange, a partner who has openness will be more receptive to differences (Blau, 1964) to build a positive LMX relationship.

5. Neuroticism

Neuroticism is associated with low self-esteem and effectiveness. Individuals with low self-esteem will tend to withdraw from challenging situations, are not confident in their abilities, provide little feedback, and are less attractive to others (Turban and Dougherty, 1994). Low effectiveness is also associated with negative emotional states, which significantly determines the quality of LMX because it tends to see others' negative aspects (Levin and Stokes, 1989; Watson and Clark, 1984). Another study states that a person with high neuroticism is limited in social skills and does not like long-term relationships needed in building commitment and trust (Judge et al., 1997, Raja et al., 2004). Leaders with stable emotions (low neuroticism) will have intense anxiety and rarely become hostile to others and even tend to yield when dealing with followers (Smith and Canger, 2004).

Leader-Member Exchange

Unlike traditional leadership approaches, in general, leader members exchange (LMX) provides an understanding that leaders have different behaviors among their followers (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). The leader gives assignments based on the degree of positive relationship he has with his followers. The primary and significant job is usually given to followers who develop and have a good relationship with themselves because the LMX applies social exchange concepts and reciprocity (Settoon et al., 1996; Wayne et al., 1997; Uhl-Bien and Maslyn, 2003).

LMX theory develops a working relationship between

The Measurements of Follower Performance in aspects of Leadership, Personality, Leader-Member Exchange, and Trustworthiness

leaders and followers, consisting of three phases: role taking, role making, and role routinization. At the role-taking stage, the leader makes assignments and evaluates followers' behavior and performance to assess their motivation and potential (Graen and Scandura's, 1987). Then the role making stage, the relationship between follower leaders will be increasingly formed and stronger (Bauer & Green, 1996). The leader will allow followers to complete unstructured tasks. When followers take this opportunity, the relationship will develop into a high-quality exchange relationship (Liden et al., 1997). The final stage is role routinization, where leaders and followers build mutual understanding and expectations. Leaders and followers' behavior is intertwined (Graen & Scandura, 1987) and tends to be stable (Liden et al., 1997).

LMX is also associated with the leadership-making model (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), starting with the stranger stage called low-quality LMX due to a lack of care and commitment (Liden et al., 1997). At this stage, both parties receive a working relationship-oriented towards career exchange, followed by the acquaintance stage, where the leader and followers exchange information at the personal and work levels. This stage is critical because if it fails, it will return to the Stranger stage (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The next step is a mature partnership where the exchange occurs at the behavioral level and involves emotional factors. Followers will consider the loyalty, support, trust, respect, and assistance received from the leader. Meanwhile, the leader will consider follower support, follower dependability, and encouragement provided by followers. This relationship is called a high-quality LMX (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Trustworthiness

Tatan (2015) In previous studies on LMX, high-quality exchanges produce a high degree of trust while low-quality exchanges will produce low trust (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Trust in leaders is closely related to the capacity to be able to predict and influence the behavior of others (Borgen, 2001). Dirks and Ferrin (2002) indicate that trustworthiness can be seen from two perceptions: relation-based, which uses social exchange theories, and character-based, which depends on followers' perceptions of leader behavior.

According to Liao (2017), LMX affects overall performance (Ilies et al., 2007, Gerstner and Day, 1997). Epitropaki and Martin (2005) also stated that LMX impacts follower satisfaction, incredibly high-quality LMX (Parker and Ohly, 2008).

Shapiro et al. (1992) and Lewicki and Bunker (1995) state that there are three types of trust in a relationship, namely calculus-based trust (CBT), knowledge-based Trust (KBT), and identification-based trust (IBT). KBT is considered more like a relationship dimension than a trust dimension. Meanwhile, CBT and IBT are the primary forms of trust (Lewicki, Wiethoff, & Tomlinson, 2005).

CBT is more oriented towards transactional, economic calculations that pay attention to the relationship results than what has been spent to build it (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995). CBT is very partial and fragile and is associated with low-quality LMX (Uhl-Bien's, 2007). Each party tries to assess the rewards and prizes that have been issued to build this trust. In other words, trust is formed because it is the interest of each party (Boyd & Taylor, 1998). Graen

and Uhl-Bien (1995) state that CBT is a cash and carry transaction model.

At the IBT level, followers understand and appreciate the needs of others. The interests of followers will be protected and do not need close supervision (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). IBT will create a mature relationship (high-quality LMX) and is considered a sufficient trust (McAllister, 1995), in which there is a kind of emotional bond between parties. IBT is characterized by a high level of trust, respect, and feelings of debt (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). At this level, followers become loyal and provide support to the leader. The leader continues to rely on followers by giving access to partnerships and assistance so that followers trust their leader (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2008).

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanation above, the concept of followers' performance is strongly influenced by leadership aspects, primarily transformational leadership, personality aspects, leaders' personality, aspects of leader-member exchange, and aspects of trustworthiness. In future research, it is necessary to develop a detailed measurement scale following the subject's context to be studied.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, U.A., Datta, S., Blake-Beard, S., & Bhargava, S. (2011). Linking LMX, innovative work behavior, and turnover intentions: The mediating role of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 17(3), 208-230.
2. Agho, A.O. (2009). Perspectives of Senior Level Executives on Effective Leadership and Leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 16(2), 159-166.
3. Antelo, A., Henderson, R.L., St Clair. (2010). Understanding the Process Model of Leadership: Follower Attribute Design and Assessment. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 7(4), 9-14.
4. Berberoglu, A., Secim, H. (2015). Organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance among health care professionals: Empirical evidence from a private Hospital in Northern Cyprus. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 7(1), 64-71.
5. Bjugstad, K., Spotlight, C. (2006). A Fresh Look at Followership: A Model for Matching Followership and Leadership Styles. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*. 304-319.
6. Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R., & Wheatley, K. (2004). Role of gender match, LMX tenure, and support in leader-member exchange. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 8(2), 63-80.
7. Campbell, J. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology, in Dunnette, M. and Hough, L. (Eds) *Handbook of Organizational and Industrial Psychology*, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA, 687-732.
8. Chaleff, I. (2009). *The Courageous Follower*. San Fransisco, CA: Berret Kohler Inc.
9. Gilbert, R.D., Hyde, A.C. (1988). Followership and The Federal Worker. *Public Administration Review*, 48(6): Research Library, 962.
10. Golden, T.D., & Veiga, J.F. (2008). The impact of superior-subordinate relationships on the

The Measurements of Follower Performance in aspects of Leadership, Personality, Leader-Member Exchange, and Trustworthiness

- commitment, job satisfaction, and performance of virtual workers. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(1), 77-88.
11. Gootfredson, R.K., Aguinis, H. (2017). Leadership behaviors and follower performance: Deductive and inductive examination of theoretical rationales and underlying mechanisms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38, 558-591.
 12. Griffin, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 333-356.
 13. Grodzicki, J., & Varma, A. (2011). A comparative study of the impact of leader-member exchange in two samples: U.S.A. and Poland. *Organizations & Markets in Emerging Economies*, 2(1), 9-23.
 14. Hughes, R.L., Ginnet, R.C., Curphy, G.L. (2008). Charisma and transformational leadership. *Leadership: Enhancing Lessons from Experiences*. Boston: Irwin, McGraw Hill.
 15. Kellerman, B. (2008). *The Followership: How Follower are Creating Change and Changing Leaders*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.
 16. Kelley, R.E. (1992). *The Power of Followership: How to Create Leaders People Want to Follow and Followers who Lead Themselves*. New York: Currency Doubleday Publishing.
 17. Kocak, R. (2006). The validity and reliability of the teachers performance evaluation scale. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 6(3), 799-808.
 18. Landino, R.J. (2008). *Followership: A Literature Review of A Rising Power Beyond Leadership*. _____
 19. Michael, D.F., Harris, S.G., Giles, W.F., & Feild, H.S. (2005). The influence of supportive supervisor communication on LMX and performance: The test of a theoretical model. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, F1-F6.
 20. Morgan, G. (2007). *Images of Organization*. California: Sage Publication.
 21. Motowidlo, S.J., Schmit, M.J. (1999). Performance assessment in unique jobs. In: Ilgen, D.R., Pulakos, E.D., editors. *The Changing Nature of Job Performance: Implications for Staffing, Motivation, and Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 56-86.
 22. M Shariff, M. N., Ahmad, N. R., & Shabbir, M. S. (2020). Moderating effect of access to finance of the gem and jewelry industry. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 25, 264-279. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3809397>
 23. Muhammad, S., Shabbir, M. S., Arshad, M. A., & Mahmood, A. (2019). 4th Industrial Revolution and TVET: The Relevance of Entrepreneurship Education for Development. *Opcion*, 11-21. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429281501-1>
 24. Muhammad, S., Shabbir, M. S., & Kassim, N. M. (2019). Entrepreneur as an Individual: Review of Recent Literature on Entrepreneurial Skills. *Opcion*, 35, 582-599.
 25. Munir, S., Yasin, M. A., Shabbir, M. S., Ali, S. R., Tariq, B., Chani, M. I., Orangzab, M., & Abbas, M. (2019). Mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior on authentic leadership and employee job performance: A study of higher educational institutes in Pakistan. *Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores*. <http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticaayvalores.com/>
 26. Noorollahi, Y., Shabbir, M. S., Siddiqi, A. F., Ilyashenko, L. K., & Ahmadi, E. (2019). Review of two decade geothermal energy development in Iran, benefits, challenges, and future policy. *Geothermics*, 77, 257-266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geothermics.2018.10.004>
 27. Noreen, T., Abbas, m., Shabbir, M. S., & Al-Ghazali, B. M. (2019). Ascendancy Of Financial Education To Escalate Financial Capability Of Young Adults: Case Of Punjab, Pakistan. *International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.14456/ITJEMAST.2019.200>
 28. Normalini, M., Ramayah, T., & Shabbir, M. S. (2019). Investigating the Impact of Security Factors In E-business and Internet Banking Usage Intention among Malaysians. *Industrial Engineering & Management Systems*, 18(3), 501-510. <https://doi.org/10.7232/iems.2019.18.3.501>
 29. Ramakrishnan, J., Shabbir, M. S., Kassim, N. M., Nguyen, P. T., & Mavaluru, D. (2020). A comprehensive and systematic review of the network virtualization techniques in the IoT. *International Journal of Communication Systems*, 33(7). <https://doi.org/10.1002/dac.4331>
 30. Pitron, J.E. (2007). *The Influence of Exemplary Followership on Organizational Performance: A Phenomenological Approach. A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfilment of The Requirements for The Degree Doctor of Management in Organizational Leadership*. Dessertation. University of Phoenix. November 2007.
 31. Pitron, J.E, (2008). Ribeiro, N., Yucel, I., Gomes, D. (2018). How Transformational Leadership predicts Employees' Affective Commitment and Performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 67 (9), 1901-1917.
 32. Riggio, R.E., Chaleff, I., Fredendall, L.D. (2002). *The Art of Followership*. San Fransico, CA: Jossey Bass Print.
 33. Shabbir, M. S., Abbas, M., Aman, Q., Ali, R., & Orangzeb, K. (2019). Poverty Reduction Strategies. Exploring the link between Poverty and Corruption from less developed countries. *Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores*. <http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticaayvalores.com/>
 34. Shabbir, M. S., Abbas, M., & Tahir, M. S. (2020). HPWS and knowledge sharing behavior: The role of psychological empowerment and organizational identification in public sector banks. *Journal of Public Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2512>
 35. Schermerhorn, J.R. (2000). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
 36. Sulistyowati, M.E. (2016). Model Kepengikutan Panutan Ditinjau Dari Kepemimpinan Transformasional Dan Kepribadian Dengan Mediasi Pemberdayaa Psikologis, Komitmen Organisasi, dan Keterikatan Aktif. A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfilment of The Requirements for The Degree Doctor of Psychology. Dessertation. Airlangga University.
 37. Wathall, M., Dent, E.B. (2016). The Leader-Follower Relationship and Follower Performance. *The Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 21 (4), 1-30.
 38. Wayne, S.J., & Green, S.A. (1993). The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations*,

*The Measurements of Follower Performance in aspects of Leadership, Personality,
Leader-Member Exchange, and Trustworthiness*

46(12), 1431-1440.

39. Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., & Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
40. Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., Bommer, W.H., & Tetrick, L.E. (2002). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 590-598.
41. Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organization*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
42. Zefeiti, S.M.B.A., Mohamad, N.A. (2017). The Influence of Organizational Commitment on Omani Public Employees' Work Performance. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(2), 151-160.
43. Zhang, Z., Waldman, D.A., & Wang, Z. (2012). A multilevel investigation of leader-member exchange, informal leader emergence, and individual and team performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(1), 49-78.