

THE IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM SERBIA

Maja Strugar Jelača¹, Nemanja Berber¹, Maja Ivanović Đukić²,
Slobodan Marić^{1*}, Marijana Rodić¹

¹University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Economics, Subotica, Serbia

²University of Niš, Faculty of Economics, Niš, Serbia

Abstract

The primary purpose of this research paper is to present an empirical study framed by the Situational Leadership Theory, also referred to as the Hersey-Blanchard Model, which states that people-oriented leadership behaviours, which include more employee participation, are positively related to contextual performance. The data used in this research was collected through a combination of two quantitative instruments aimed at determining the relative contribution that the independent variables (leadership style) make to the dependent variables (contextual performance). The main method used in this research is hierarchical regression analysis. The research results revealed that people-oriented leadership behaviours with more employee participation (dominant delegating leadership style) have a positive and significant relationship with contextual performance. In terms of practice, this paper may enable organisations to understand the need for an adequate leadership style that ensures greater employee commitment and employee readiness to make additional efforts, which are beyond the job description. In terms of originality and value, along with previous research in this area, this paper enables future research and contributes to a better understanding of the impact of an adequate leadership style, as a predictor variable, on contextual performance, as dependent variable.

Keywords: Situational Leadership Theory, Hersey-Blanchard Model, leadership style, contextual performance

УТИЦАЈ СТИЛА ЛИДЕРСТВА НА КОНТЕКСТУАЛНУ ПЕРФОРМАНСУ У ОРГАНИЗАЦИЈАМА У СРБИЈИ

Апстракт

Примарна сврха овог истраживачког рада је да представи емпиријску анализу у оквиру Ситуационе теорије лидерства, засноване на Херси-Бланшар моделу. Истраживање настоји да укаже на чињеницу да је лидерско понашање оријенти-

* Corresponding author: Slobodan Marić, Faculty of Economics, University of Novi Sad, Segedinskijput 9-11, 24000 Subotica, Serbia, slobodan.marić@ef.uns.ac.rs

сано на људе, са већом партиципацијом запослених, позитивно повезано са контекстуалном перформансом. Методологија за прикупљање података заснива се на комбинацији два квантитативна инструмента, са циљем да се утврди релативни допринос независне варијабле (стил лидерства) зависној варијабли (контекстуална перформанса). Квантитативна анализа у склопу истраживања извршена је помоћу хијерархијске регресије. Резултати истраживања указују на то да лидерска понашања оријентисана на људе са већим учешћем запослених (доминантни стил лидерства делегирања) имају позитиван и значајан однос са контекстуалном перформансом. У практичном смислу, резултати овог истраживања омогућавају организацијама да схвате потребу за адекватним стилем лидерства који обезбеђује већу посвећеност запослених и њихову спремност на додатне напоре који су ван описа посла. Заједно са досадашњим истраживањима у овој области, овај рад представља полазну тачку будућим истраживањима и доприноси бољем разумевању утицаја адекватног стила лидерства као предикторске варијабле на контекстуалну перформансу, која представља зависне варијабле.

Кључне речи: Теорија ситуационог лидерства, Херси-Бланшардов модел лидерства, стил лидерства, контекстуална перформанса

INTRODUCTION

Leadership style is a highly discussed and studied topic in the field of management due to its influence on the job performance of employees and the competitiveness of the organisation. Systematic research into leadership very often employs a leader-oriented approach and is mostly focused on identifying the specific universal characteristics and behaviour styles which make some leaders more efficient than others (Day, 2014; Lord, Day, Zaccaro, Avolio, & Eagly, 2017). However, the failure to identify such universal characteristics prompted research to pay more attention to the situation, or the context, in which leaders function. According to Fiddler (1978), leadership does not occur in a vacuum. Better performance requires harmonising leadership style and situational factors. After a significant period of emphasising the importance of the organisational context in the field of management (Johns, 2006), theoretical literature and empirical results reaffirm and highlight the importance of contextual factors and their impact both on leadership and the results of leadership (Ayman & Adams, 2012; Hannah, Uhl-Bien, Avolio & Cavaretta, 2009).

Although situational leadership is currently one of the most popular areas in leadership studies (Dinh et al., 2014; Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney & Cogliser, 2010), there is a lack of systematic approach to the topic, as well as a lack of agreement on what comprises the leadership context and contextual performances (Ayman & Adams, 2012). Within the contextual approach to leadership studies, authors endeavour to identify the impact of contextual factors on the leadership process, on leaders, followers, and the leader-follower relationship, as well as on leadership results in the form of, among others, efficiency, attitude, behaviour and cognition (Hiller, DeChurch, Murase, & Doty, 2011), where contextual

factors are observed as mediators between the leadership process and its results. When it comes to Serbia, research papers on situational leadership are very limited, while empirical research in this area is very rare. Further theoretical and empirical research in this area is needed in order to increase the competitiveness of Serbian companies by improving their management. The aim of this paper is to examine the influence of leadership style on contextual performance in organisations in Serbia.

The researchers' main assumption is that the leader's style directly influences group performance and goal accomplishment, resulting in specific employee behaviour and performance. Additionally, the researchers assume that the leader's style indirectly influences efficiency through other factors. For example, leadership style can affect the adoption of ICT and, consequently, affect productivity (Čudanov, Todorović & Jaško, 2012). An empirical study was conducted on a sample of 100 respondents from large organisations in Serbia in order to test the validity of this hypothesis.

The paper first gives an overview of the literature concerning the relationship between leadership style and contextual performance. The second part of the paper illustrates the methodology, the sources of data processed by statistical procedures, the selected indicators, and the research variables. The final part of the paper presents the results of the research, discusses them, and draws conclusions and recommendations to managers from them.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Leadership features are among the significant driving forces on which an organisation's performance depends and by which it can be significantly improved (Sorrentino & Field, 2013). Leaders and employees cooperate on a higher motivation level, creating a higher degree of trust, loyalty, and inspiration, which allows performance levels to rise above expectations (Slamet, Toyib, Djumilah & Troena, 2013). Also, leaders can inspire employees to express unconditional loyalty and allegiance to the organisation and its goals (Judge, Bono, Ilies & Gerhardt, 2013). Such a behaviour pattern is related to the employees' willing commitment to additional responsibilities and roles (Gautam, Dick, Wagner, Upadhyay & Davis, 2006; Leković, Amidžić & Ivanović-Djukić, 2022).

Until the 1950s, scientific research in the area of leadership focused on leaders' characteristics and behaviour in order to identify criteria for differentiating between leaders and non-leaders (Day & Antonakis, 2012). Afterwards, this limited view of leadership underwent significant changes with the introduction of the situation-based model of leader efficiency, owing to the identification of the facts that leaders do not exist in a vacuum and that leadership is not an individual phenomenon (Bennis, 2007). According to the situational approach, leadership will have a posi-

tive impact on the achievement of organisational goals only if the leadership style is adapted to the situational context in which the activities are carried out. There is no generally accepted view of what determines the situation context. For this reason, several situational theories of leadership have emerged. One of the best-known approaches to situational leadership was developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1969), based on Reddin (1967) and 3-D management theory (Northouse, 2004; Yukl, 2006; Kaifi, Noor, Nguyen, Aslami, & Khanfar, 2014).

HERSEY - BLANCHARD MODEL OF SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY

This model comprises three dimensions: relationship-oriented behaviour, task/job-oriented behaviour, and employee readiness (Blanchard, 2008). Leadership style implies the structure of a person's behaviour that seeks to influence others (Blanchard, 2010). According to this model, leadership styles are classified into four different categories determined by the two basic dimensions of this model: relationship (employee) oriented behaviour and task/job oriented behaviour. The first, *directive leadership style*, is maximally commanded with minimal support - leaders are focused on goal-oriented communication which contains instructions on what and how goals should be achieved by subordinates. Another is the *coaching style*, which shows a high level of focus and a high level of support - leaders are in direct communication with both dimensions, with the aim of achieving goals and meeting the social and emotional needs of employees. In the third, the *supportive style*, the leader is expected to show a high level of support and minimal commanding behaviour - the leader is not exclusively focused on goals and work tasks, but shows maximum support to employees in order to demonstrate the competencies necessary to perform the job. The last, the *delegating style*, is characterised by minimal support to subordinates and minimal commanding behaviour - the leader provides the minimum social support and minimum instructions necessary to perform tasks in order to provide motivation and self-confidence for the independent performance of work tasks. The model emphasises that the appropriate leadership style is determined by the degree of individual readiness, manifested in each given moment in every employee. The level of employee readiness on the continuum line is divided into four categories, as a combination of competence and job dedication: R1 - low competence and dedication; R2 - low competence and high dedication; R3 - high competencies and low dedication; and R4 - high competence and dedication. As employee development from lower to higher levels implies a connection with an appropriate level of leadership, thus forming an optimum combination, leadership efficiency repre-

sents a combination of the maximum readiness level and the appropriate leadership style (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969).

This paper is based on this theory due to the numerous advantages it has. First of all, this theory has passed the market test. The situational theory is well-known and frequently used in the process of leader training in the organisation. For example, it is used as the main tool in training and development programmes in more than 500 companies on the Fortune 500 list (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 2001; Lacey, 2019). The second advantage of the theory is its practicality, reflected in its comprehensibility, intuitive accessibility, and ease of use in various circumstances (Franklin, 2009). The theory's third advantage is the fact that it highlights the leader's flexibility, which implies the need for the leader to identify their employees' needs and apply the appropriate leadership style (Thompson, 2009).

We believe that the application of this theory can have positive results in modern organisations operating in a turbulent environment. In conditions of fierce competition, employees are expected to do more than what is defined by work division and job description, which implies performing activities that do not explicitly correspond to their formal roles and scopes of responsibility (Motowidlo & Harrison, 2014; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000; Rodić & Marić, 2021). To maximise the overall employee performance, one of the leader's main tasks is to direct employees to behaviour reaching beyond personal interest, or to behaviour which appreciates the interests of the entire organisation. Such a form of employee behaviour, exceeding the behaviour framework related to formal job tasks, is referred to as contextual performance.

CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE AS A RESULT OF LEADERSHIP

Contextual performance can be defined as comprising of those elements which support the organisational, social and psychological context directly affecting the completion of tasks and the business success of the organisation as a whole (Werner, 2000). Contextual performance can emphasize different features of the work context, such as the impact on the psychological states of individuals, which can affect the likelihood of other individuals carrying out actions that contribute to organisational effectiveness, or the impact on behaviours that affect an individual's own readiness. Taking on additional responsibility in the form of voluntary help to colleagues with backlogs, allocating additional effort to completing tasks on time, showing attention to colleagues so as to build good relationships, and accepting and assisting new employees represent behaviours characteristic of the employees' contextual performance.

In situation-based approach theories, many contextual performances are analysed. For instance, Borman and Motowidlo (1993) de-

scribe five types of contextual activities: volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job; persisting with extra enthusiasm or effort when necessary to complete one's own task activities successfully; helping and cooperating with others; following organisational rules and procedures even when they are personally inconvenient; and endorsing, supporting, and defending organisational objectives (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Leadership features are among the significant driving forces on which an organisation's performance depends and by which it can be significantly improved. As the key agents of organisational decisions such as mergers, takeovers, development, resource allocation, and creating and retaining stakeholder values, leadership features are among the significant driving forces on which an organisation's performance depends and by which it can be significantly improved (Avolio, 1999). As for interpersonal relations, leaders and employees cooperate on a higher motivation level, creating a higher degree of trust, loyalty, and inspiration, which leads to performance levels exceeding expectations (Bass, 1985). Research and meta-analyses conducted so far point to a positive correlation between leadership, employee performance, and the organisation's results (Dumdum, Lowe & Avolio, 2002; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Leadership inspires employees to express unconditional loyalty and allegiance to the organisation and its goals, which is predominantly the result of emotional factors, rather than logic and rationale. Such a behaviour pattern is related to the employees' willing commitment to additional responsibilities and roles (Gautam, Dick, Wagner, Upadhyay & Davis, 2006). An emotional link with the organisation results in pro-social behaviour, including cooperation, help and sharing in relation to all of the organisation's shareholders. In conditions of fierce competition, employees are expected to do more than defined by work division and job description, which implies performing activities that do not explicitly correspond to their formal roles and scopes of responsibility (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996). Such a form of employee behaviour, exceeding the behaviour framework related to formal job tasks is referred to as contextual performance. Taking on additional responsibility in the form of voluntary help to colleagues with backlogs, allocating additional effort to completing tasks on time, showing attention to colleagues so as to build good relationships, and accepting and assisting new employees represent the behaviour characteristic of the employees' contextual performance. The above shows that contextual performance supports the organisational, social, and psychological contexts directly affecting the completion of tasks and the business success of the organisation as a whole. Contrary to task performance, which predominantly manifests on an individual level, contextual performance can be identified with employee behaviour on an organisational level. Another significant difference between these two di-

mensions of performance lies in the fact that contextual performance does not depend on individual professional competencies, but exclusively on individual attitudes and solidarity to others (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). To maximise the overall employee performance, one of the leader's main tasks is to direct employees to behaviour reaching beyond personal interest, or to behaviour which appreciates the interests of the entire organisation. Research in the area of contextual performance is mostly oriented in the following directions: (a) the importance of the manager's experience in assessing the organisation's members in relation to overall performance, especially in relation to task performance and contextual performance; (b) whether personal characteristics determine contextual performance in relation to task performance; (c) the interdependence of contextual performance and organisational efficiency; and (d) the impact of the organisation's characteristics on contextual performance (Borman, 2004).

Theoretical papers and meta-analyses point out a positive correlation between leadership style, contextual performance, employee performance, and the organisation's results (Dumdum, et al., 2002). Also, empirical research conducted in companies from developed countries shows that leadership style significantly impacts employee's contextual performance (Osabiya, 2015; Yoshioka, 2009; Stojanović & Marić, 2018). On the discrete contextual level, people-oriented leadership styles play an important role in shaping contextual performance and have a high impact on employees' job performance (Osborn, Hunt & Jauch, 2002; Antonakis, 2017). Furthermore, leadership style affects not only performance but also the organisational culture (Savović, Nikolić & Zlatanović, 2021; Janicijević, 2022). We believe that the situation is similar in organisations in Serbia. Accordingly, the following hypotheses were defined:

- H1 – There is a statistically significant impact of leadership style on contextual performance in organisations in Serbia;*
- H2 – Predominantly people-oriented leadership styles (supporting style, delegating style) have a greater impact on contextual performance in organisations in Serbia.*

A significant number of studies have noted the presence of employee orientation towards a certain leadership style, which is positively correlated with direct leadership results and is manifested in employee satisfaction and job performance (Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993). The results of Rise, Setiawan and dan Nimran's (2010) research point towards the fact that employee-oriented leadership styles have a positive and significant effect on the employee. In discussing the results of their research, Roscahyo and Prijati (2013) note that democratic leadership, authoritarian and free control styles both partially and simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Tampi (2014) likewise notes that leadership styles both partially and simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

METHODOLOGY

Sampling Method and Data Collection

Primary research was conducted in order to test the previously mentioned hypotheses. The research was carried out in the period between June and September 2021. The questionnaires were distributed to employees and managers in writing/online form. One part of the questionnaire included questions related to the general information about the respondents: gender, age, years of service, level of education, and position in the organisational structure. The second part of the questionnaire included questions related to contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Borman, Penner, Allen & Motowidlo, 2001) and leadership style (LEAD-Other instrument Hersey & Blanchard 1969).

Sample Characteristics

The basic set of research, which by its nature has all the characteristics of a closed population due to the defined final number of members in the form of employees/individuals of the largest companies in the Republic of Serbia in 2021, represents the sampling design which takes into account primarily the properties of the base set, while the sample itself has the characteristics of a random sample of the final base set, wherein a sample design with repetition and a known sampling probability is present. A sample of $n = 100$ has the characteristics of a proportional stratified sample, with a size of 0.10, because the list of 100 companies was divided into 10 groups, each consisting of ten companies, so that the respondents of companies of different degrees of success would be evenly represented. The selection of companies in each group was made alphabetically, and the strata within the selected companies was completed by the immediate respondents according to the snowball principle.

Research Variables and Instruments

In order to measure contextual performance, we used 16 items developed to tap the construct described by Borman et al. (1993, 2001). Supervisors rated participants on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = not at all likely to 5 = extremely likely (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Contextual performance as a dependent variable was included in analyses as a regression factor score. *Leadership styles*, as an independent variable, was measured according to the Hersey-Blanchard model (LEAD-Other instrument Hersey/Blanchard 1969). Previous research results show that variables such as position, age, gender, level of education and education field have a predictable impact on leadership results, and they are, therefore, included as control variables.

Analyses and Procedures

Correlation methods were applied in order to examine the relationship between leadership styles and contextual performances. Regression methods were applied in order to examine the influence of leadership styles on contextual performances. The data was analysed using the SPSS 21.0 software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

At the beginning of our analysis, we checked the measure of internal consistency. A Cronbach’s Alpha value of 0.85 indicates a very good compatibility of the questions in the questionnaire for a given sample.

Table 1. Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.853	0.897	20

Source: Authors' Calculation

A correlation analysis was performed to examine the nature and degree of the relationship between the predictor and criterion variables. The results of the correlation analysis and descriptive statistics are shown in Table 2. There is a positive and strong correlation between contextual performances and all leadership styles, at the level of significance of 5% for the Directing, Supporting, and Delegating Leadership Style. The level of significance of the correlation between contextual performance and the Coaching Leadership Style is 10%.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics & correlations

	Mean	Std. Deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Position: Manager/Empl	1.50	0.50	1									
2. Age	39.12	9.78	-0.22**	1								
3. Gender: Male/Female	1.48	0.50	0.017	0.037	1							
4. Education Level	1.92	0.78	-0.53**	0.007	0.005	1						
5. Area of Education:	1.45	0.50	0.084	0.005	0.029	-0.11	1					
6. Directing Leadership	21.63	5.12	-0.349**	-0.04	0.00	-0.34**	-0.04	1				
7. Coaching Leadership	21.43	4.58	-0.420**	-0.09	-0.002	0.41**	-0.05	0.73**	1			
8. Supporting Leadership	20.60	4.24	-0.291**	-0.144*	0.03	0.400*	-0.04	0.66**	0.7**	1		
9. Delegating Leadership	21.43	4.70	-0.339**	-0.02	0.03	0.40**	-0.05	0.73**	0.8**	0.793**	1	
0. Contextual Performance	0.00	1.00	-0.273**	0.021	0.01	0.31**	-0.25	0.53**	0.56*	0.55**	0.58**	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: the authors' calculation

Hierarchical multiple regression was applied in order to examine the influence of leadership style (each of the four leadership styles) on

contextual performances. To establish control over the unexpected impact of independent variables, the variables of position, age, gender, level of education, and education area were introduced. The results are presented in Tables 3 through 6.

Table 3. Hierarchical regression coefficients ^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta				Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	0.359	0.595		.604	.547					
	Position	-0.316	0.161	-0.159	-1.970	0.05	-0.27	-0.137	-0.13	0.66	1.496
	Age	-0.004	0.007	-0.037	-0.535	0.59	0.021	-0.038	-0.03	0.92	1.082
	Gender	0.038	0.131	0.019	0.291	0.77	0.010	0.020	0.01	0.99	1.002
	Education level	0.279	0.101	0.216	2.759	0.00	0.310	0.191	0.18	0.70	1.413
	Education area	-0.219	0.133	-0.109	-1.64	0.10	-0.15	-0.115	-0.10	0.98	1.017
2	(Constant)	-2.045	0.615		-3.325	0.00					
	Position:	-0.040	0.147	-0.020	-0.270	0.78	-0.27	-0.019	-0.01	0.62	1.596
	Age	0.000	0.006	-0.004	-0.067	0.94	0.021	-0.005	-0.00	0.91	1.088
	Gender	0.063	0.116	0.031	0.538	0.59	0.010	0.038	0.03	0.99	1.003
	Education level	0.190	0.090	0.147	2.108	0.03	0.310	0.147	0.12	0.69	1.437
	Education area	-0.198	0.118	-0.099	-1.683	0.09	-0.15	-0.118	-0.09	0.98	1.018
	Directing Style	0.092	0.012	0.476	7.561	0.00	0.53	0.471	0.44	0.85	1.171

a. Dependent variable: REGR factor score – Contextual Performance

Source: the authors' calculation

Before analysing the results of the set model (Tables 3 through 6) of multiple regression, we want to point out the fulfilment of the assumption of multicollinearity. In addition to the correlation coefficients, the values of Tolerance and VIF indicate the existence of multicollinearity. Having in mind the limit values of these indicators (Tolerance <0.10; VIF >10), we can say that the values are the indicator of all variables in the domain of limit values.

Table 3a. Model summary ^c

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.354 ^a	0.12	0.104	0.94657	0.126	5.80	5	202	0.000
2	0.565 ^b	0.31	0.299	0.83729	0.194	57.16	1	201	0.000

a. Predictors: (Constant). Education area: social/technical; Age; Gender: male/female; Education: elementary/BSc/MSc/PhD; Position: manager/employee

b. Predictors: (Constant). Education area: social/technical; Age; Gender: male/female; Education: elementary/BSc/MSc/PhD; Position: manager/employee; Directing Leadership Style

c. Dependent variable: REGR factor score – Contextual Performance

Source: the authors' calculation

Table 3 shows a positive and significant impact (5%) of the Directing Leadership Style on contextual performance. Table 3a represents the model summary and shows result that evaluate the whole model using the coefficient of determination, r^2 . The coefficient of determination is 0.12. This value

means that the model explains 12.60% of the variance of the dependent variable (Contextual Performance).

Table 4. Coefficients ^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Colinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Partial Tolerance	VIF	
	(Constant)	0.359	0.595				.604	0.547		
Position	-0.316	0.161	-0.159	-1.970	0.050	-0.273	-0.137	-0.130	0.668	1.496
Age	-0.004	0.007	-0.037	-0.535	0.593	0.021	-0.038	-0.035	0.924	1.082
Gender	0.03	0.131	0.019	0.291	0.772	0.010	0.020	0.019	0.998	1.002
Education level	0.27	0.101	0.216	2.759	0.006	0.310	0.191	0.182	0.708	1.413
Education area	-0.219	0.133	-0.109	-1.643	0.102	-0.148	-0.115	-0.108	0.983	1.017
(Constant)	-2.728	0.646		-4.224	0.000					
Position	0.05	0.148	0.029	0.389	0.698	-0.273	0.027	0.022	0.602	1.662
Age	0.00	0.006	0.044	0.730	0.466	0.02	0.051	0.042	0.898	1.113
Gender	0.07	0.115	0.039	0.678	0.498	0.01	0.048	0.039	0.996	1.004
Education level	0.13	0.090	0.107	1.541	0.125	0.31	0.108	0.088	0.681	1.468
Education area	-0.247	0.116	-0.123	-2.123	0.035	-0.148	-0.148	-0.122	0.982	1.018
Coaching Leadership Style	0.11	0.014	0.527	8.030	0.000	0.55	0.493	0.461	0.763	1.310

a. Dependent Variable: REGR factor score - Contextual Performance

Source: the authors' calculation

Table 4 shows a positive and significant impact (5%) of the Coaching Leadership Style on contextual performance. Table 4a presents the model summary using the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.338$). The model explains 33.8% of the variance in Contextual Performance. The subsequently included independent variable explained the additional 21.2% of the variance of Contextual Performance (r^2 changed by 0.212, F changed by $(1, 201) = 64.488$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 4a. Model summary ^c

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.354 ^a	0.13	0.104	0.94657	0.126	5.80	5	202	0.000
2	0.581 ^b	0.34	0.318	0.82567	0.212	64.488	1	201	0.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education area: social/technical; Age; Gender: male/female; Education: elementary/BSc/MSc/PhD; Position: manager/employee

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education area: social/technical; Age; Gender: male/female; Education: elementary/BSc/MSc/PhD; Position: manager/employee; Coaching Leadership Style

c. Dependent Variable: REGR factor score - Contextual Performance

Source: authors' calculation

Table 5 shows a positive and significant impact (5%) of the Supporting Leadership Style on contextual performance.

Table 5. Coefficients ^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	0.35	0.595		0.60	0.54					
Position	-0.316	0.161	-0.159	-1.97	0.05	-0.273	-0.13	-0.13	0.668	1.496
Age	-0.004	0.007	-0.037	-0.53	0.59	0.02	-0.03	-0.03	0.924	1.082
Gender	0.03	0.131	0.019	0.29	0.77	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.998	1.002
Education level	0.27	0.101	0.216	2.75	0.00	0.31	0.19	0.18	0.708	1.413
Education area	-0.219	0.133	-0.109	-1.64	0.10	-0.148	-0.11	-0.10	0.983	1.017
(Constant)	-2.386	0.622		-3.83	0.00					
Position	-0.118	0.142	-0.059	-0.82	0.40	-0.273	-0.05	-0.04	0.648	1.543
Age	0.00	0.006	0.037	0.61	0.53	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.903	1.108
Gender	0.03	0.115	0.018	0.30	0.75	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.998	1.002
Education level	0.11	0.091	0.087	1.24	0.21	0.31	0.08	0.07	0.671	1.491
Education area	-0.235	0.116	-0.117	-2.02	0.04	-0.148	-0.14	-0.11	0.983	1.018
Supporting Lead. Style	0.12	0.015	0.502	8.01	0.00	0.55	0.49	0.46	0.841	1.189

a. Dependent Variable: REGR factor score - Contextual Performance

Source: the authors' calculation

Table 5a presents the model summary using the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.337$). The summary indicates that the model explains 33.7% of the variance of the dependent variable (Contextual Performance). The subsequently included independent variable explained the additional 21.2% of the variance of Contextual Performance (r^2 changed by 0.211, F changed by $(1, 201) = 64.274$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 5a. Model summary ^c

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.354 ^a	0.13	0.104	0.94657	0.126	5.80	5	202	0.000
2	0.581 ^b	0.34	0.318	0.82600	0.212	64.274	1	201	0.000

a. Predictors: (Constant). Education area: social/technical; Age; Gender: male/female; Education: elementary/BSc/MSc/PhD; Position: manager/employee

b. Predictors: (Constant). Education area: social/technical; Age; Gender: male/female; Education: elementary/BSc/MSc/PhD; Position: manager/employee; Supporting Leadership Style

c. Dependent Variable: REGR factor score - Contextual Performance

Source: the authors' calculation

Table 6 shows a positive and significant impact (5%) of the Delegating Leadership Style on contextual performance.

Table 6. Coefficients ^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Colinearity Statistics		
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part order	Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	0.359	0.595		0.60	0.54					
	Position	-0.316	0.161	-0.159	-1.97	0.05	-0.27	-0.13	-0.13	0.668	1.496
	Age	-0.004	0.007	-0.037	-0.53	0.59	0.02	-0.038	-0.03	0.924	1.082
	Gender	0.038	0.131	0.019	0.29	0.77	0.01	0.020	0.01	0.998	1.002
	Education level	0.279	0.101	0.216	2.75	0.00	0.31	0.191	0.18	0.708	1.413
	Education area	-0.219	0.133	-0.109	-1.64	0.10	-0.14	-0.115	-0.01	0.983	1.017
2	(Constant)	-2.117	0.580		-3.64	0.00					
	Position	-0.089	0.139	-0.045	-0.63	0.52	-0.27	-0.045	-0.03	0.645	1.550
	Age	-0.001	0.006	-0.014	-0.24	0.80	0.02	-0.017	-0.01	0.922	1.084
	Gender	0.014	0.112	0.007	0.12	0.89	0.01	0.009	0.00	0.997	1.003
	Education level	0.092	0.089	0.071	1.03	0.30	0.31	0.073	0.05	0.667	1.499
	Education area	-0.231	0.114	-0.115	-2.03	0.00	-0.14	-0.142	-0.11	0.983	1.018
	Delegating Lead. Style	0.116	0.013	0.541	8.77	0.00	0.58	0.526	0.49	0.829	1.206

a. Dependent Variable: REGR factor score - Contextual Performance

Source: the authors' calculation

Table 6a presents the model summary using the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.368$). This model explains 36.8% of the variance of the dependent variable (Contextual Performance). The subsequently included independent variable explained the additional 24.2% of the variance of Contextual Performance (r^2 changed by 0.211, F changed by $(1.201) = 77.030$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 6a. Model summary ^c

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.354 ^a	0.13	0.104	0.94657	0.126	5.80	5	202	0.000
2	0.607 ^b	0.37	0.349	0.80683	0.242	77.030	1	201	0.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education area: social/technical; Age; Gender: male/female; Education: elementary/BSc/MSc/PhD; Position: manager/employee

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education area: social/technical; Age; Gender: male/female; Education: elementary/BSc/MSc/PhD; Position: manager/employee; Delegating Leadership Style

c. Dependent Variable: REGR factor score - Contextual Performance

Source: the authors' calculation

Based on the results of hierarchical regression, we can conclude that leadership style determines contextual performance. Thus, hypothesis H1, which states that there is a statistically significant impact of leadership style on the employees' contextual performance as the dependent variable, is confirmed.

After the variables were entered into Step One, the value of the coefficient of determination was $r^2 = 0.126$. The model explains 12.60% of the variance of Contextual Performance. In the second model, concerning the Coaching Leadership Style, the value of the coefficient of determination is $r^2 = 0.338$. Thus, the model explains 33.8% of the variance of the dependent variable (the subsequently included independent variable explained the additional 21.2% of the variance of

Contextual Performance: r^2 changed by 0.212, and F changed by $(1.201) = 64.488$, $p < 0.05$). In the third model, concerning the Supporting Leadership Style, the value of the coefficient of determination is $r^2 = 0.337$, which means that the model explained 33.7% of the variance of the dependent variable (the subsequently included independent variable explained the additional 21.2% of variance of Contextual Performance: r^2 changed by 0.211, and F changed by $(1.201) = 64.274$, $p < 0.05$). In the fourth model, concerning the Delegating Leadership Style, the value of the coefficient of determination is $r^2 = 0.368$. Therefore, the model explains 36.8% of the variance of the dependent variable. We can conclude that people-oriented leadership styles, respectively, have a higher share in the variance of the dependent variable, which is visible from the determination coefficient. The dependent variable and the predictor variables, in comparison with the control variables, showed a statistical significance with a medium loading of correlation in relation to the position/manager variable, and a statistical significance with a positive direction and medium loading in relation to the level of education. These results, which were expected, confirm the role of the control variables.

Analysing each individual model, we can conclude that the highest contribution to the interpretation of the variance of contextual performance is made by the dominantly people-oriented Delegating Leadership Style. In other words, a greater contribution to explaining the dependent variables is made by people-oriented (the Supporting and Delegating) than task-oriented (the Directing and Coaching) leadership styles and behaviour. Task-centred (Coaching and Directing) styles have a minor or negligible impact on contextual performance. Thus, hypothesis H2 is confirmed.

To establish how much each control variable contributes to the final equation, regression coefficients were used in the analysis. The results are shown in Segment 2 of Tables 3 through 6. The Segment contains cumulatively presented results, obtained with all variables entered into the equation. Only one control variable – Education level has a positive and significant impact on contextual performances in all models, while Education area has a significant, but negative impact on contextual performance.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this empirical study was to examine the relationship between leadership style and contextual performance. The research results revealed that relations-oriented leadership behaviours (dominant delegating leadership style) have a positive and significant impact on contextual performance. The analysis clarified and confirmed the basic research assumption, which states that relations-oriented leadership behaviours (supporting and delegating leadership style) have a stronger impact

on contextual performance than task-oriented leadership behaviours (directing and coaching style). The analysed and presented research results have confirmed both hypotheses. First, the results confirmed that leadership style determines contextual performance in the organisations in Serbia. Second, the results confirmed that leadership predominantly oriented towards developing interpersonal relationships with employees has a larger impact on contextual performance in organisations in Serbia.

Thus, in addition to the results and impact process, context becomes one of the three most frequent factors used in defining leadership. Leadership is one of the significant driving forces that an organisation's performance depends on and by which it can be significantly improved. It can be seen from the above that contextual performance supports the organisational, social and psychological contexts directly affecting the performance of assigned tasks and the business success of the organisation as a whole.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

In terms of practice, the results of this research may enable organisations to understand the need for an adequate leadership style that ensures greater employee commitment and employee readiness for additional efforts that are beyond the job description. This paper provides direct insight into the prevailing leadership style, and the need to develop an adequate leadership style that will play a significant role in the development of a dedicated workforce which will, in turn, contribute to better business results. This paper provides empirical evidence which confirms the influence of leadership style on organisational performance. Together with previous research in this area, this paper can enable future research and contribute to a better understanding of the impact of adequate leadership style, as a predictor variable, on contextual performance as dependent variables.

Acknowledgements: *This paper is part of the research project "Effects of emotional intelligence of managers on the performance and sustainability of organizations" financed by the Provincial Secretariat for Higher Education and Scientific Research of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, Republic of Serbia. Project Number: 142-451-2269/2021-01/02.*

REFERENCES

- Antonakis, J. (2017). On doing better science: From thrill of discovery to policy implications. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eaqua.2017.01.006>
- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Sage Publications.

- Ayman, R. & Adams, S. (2012). *Contingencies, context, situations, and leadership: In D. V. Day, / J. Antonakis (Ed.): The nature of leadership (pp. 218-256)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.01.006>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Collier Macmillan.
- Bennis, W. (2007). The challenges of leadership in the modern world: Introduction to the special issue. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 2-5. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.2>
- Blanchard, K. (2008). Situational Leadership-Adjust your style to suit the development level. *Executive excellence*, 25(5), 19-36.
- Blanchard, K.H. (2010). *Leading at A Higher Level*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River.
- Borman, W. C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current directions in psychological science*, 13(6), 238-241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00316.x>
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 52-69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00163>
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. M. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00163>
- Čudanov, M., Todorović, I., & Jaško, O. (2012). Correlation between soft organizational features and development of ICT infrastructure. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Balkan Conference in Informatics* (pp. 150-155). <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/2371316.2371345>
- Day, D. V. (Ed.). (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organisations* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press;
- Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2012). Leadership: Past, present, and future. *The Nature of Leadership*, 2, 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199928309.013.0022>
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.005>
- Dumdum, U.R., Lowe, K.B. & Avolio, B.J. (2013). "A Meta-Analysis of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension", Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead 10th Anniversary Edition (Monographs in Leadership and Management, Vol. 5), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 39-70. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-357120130000005008>
- Fiedler, F. E. (1978). *The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process. In Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 11, pp. 59-112)*. Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60005-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60005-2)
- Franklin, T. (2000). *Situational leadership: An analysis of public school teachers readiness levels and preferred principal leadership styles*. (PhD Dissertation) Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/dissertations/AAI3345644>
- Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. W., Mahoney, K. T., & Cogliser, C. C. (2010). Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: A review of The Leadership Quarterly's second decade, 2000–2009. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 922-958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.003>
- Gautam, T, Dick, R.V., Wagner, U., Upadhyay, N., & Davis, A.J. (2006). Organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational commitment in Nepal. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 8(3), 305–320. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2005.00172.x>
- Hannah, S. T., Uhl-Bien, M., Avolio, B. J., & Cavarretta, F. L. (2009). A framework for examining leadership in extreme contexts. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(6), 897-919.

- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training & Development Journal*, 23(5), 26–34.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: leading human resources*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J., Prentice Hall.
- Hiller, N. J., DeChurch, L. A., Murase, T., & Doty, D. (2011). Searching for outcomes of leadership: A 25-year review. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1137-1177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310393520>
- Hogan, R., & Judge, T. (2013). Personality and leadership. *The Oxford handbook of leadership*, 37-46.
- Janicijević, N. (2022). Culture, power and structure of organization: an integrative research framework, *Teme*, 46(1), 159-174. <https://doi.org/10.22190/TEME201002009J>
- Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of management review*, 31(2), 386-408. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.20208687>
- Kaifi, B. A., Noor, A. O., Nguyen, N. L., Aslami, W., & Khanfar, N. M. (2014). The importance of situational leadership in the workforce: A study based on gender, place of birth, and generational affiliation. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 3(2), 29-40;
- Kirkpatrick, S.A., & Locke, E.A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.1.36>
- Lacey, J. M. (2019). *Student development and studio management in applied music teaching through implementation of the situational leadership model*. (PhD Dissertation) Retrieved from http://purl.flvc.org/fsu/fd/2019_Spring_Lacey_fsu_0071E_15154
- Leković, B., Amidžić, R., Ivanović-Djukić, M. (2022). Factors affecting intentions of opportunity and necessity driven entrepreneurs: Case of south east Europa, *Teme*, 46(1), 129-144. <https://doi.org/10.22190/TEME200713007A>
- Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 434–451. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000089>
- Motowidlo, S. & Harrison J. K. (2014) Cognitive ability on job performance. *Human Performance*, 29(4), 331-346;
- Motowidlo, S.J., & Van Scotter, J.R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 475–480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.475>
- Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage Publications.
- Osabiya, B. (2015). The Impact of Leadership Style on Employee's Performance and Productivity in an Organization. *Journal of Public Administration*, 54-91.
- Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 797-837. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00154-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00154-6)
- Reddin, W. J. (1967). The 3-D management style theory. *Training and Development Journal*, 21(4), 8-17.
- Rahmat, R., Ramly, M., Mallongi, S., & Kalla, R. (2019). The leadership style effect on the job satisfaction and the performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management and Education (APJME)*, 2(1).
- Rodić, M., & Marić, S. (2021). Leadership style and employee readiness: Basic factors of leadership efficiency. *Strategic Management*, 26(1), 53-65. <https://doi.org/10.5937/StraMan2101053R>
- Roscahyo, A. (2013). Pengaruh gaya kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Rumah Sakit Siti Khodijah Sidoarjo. *Jurnal Ilmu & Riset Manajemen*, 2(12), 1-16.
- Savović, S., Nikolić, J., & Zlatanović, D. (2021). Acquisitions, Organizational Culture and Performance: Empirical Evidence from Acquired Company in Serbia.

- Management: Journal of Sustainable Business and Management Solutions in Emerging Economies*. <https://doi.org/10.7595/management.fon.2021.0007>
- Slamet, A. T., Hadiwidjojo, D., & Troena, E. A. (2013). The influence of situational leadership on job satisfaction and job performance (a study on Trans Jakarta Bus way as transportation service in DKI Jakarta). *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 2(2), 105-113.
- Sorrentino, R. M., & Field, N. (1986). Emergent leadership over time: The functional value of positive motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1091.
- Stojanović, S., & Marić, S. (2018). Komunikacija kao mera performance liderstva, *Anali Ekonomskog fakulteta u Subotici*, (40), 81-94. <https://doi.org/10.5937/AnEkSub1840081S>
- Tampi, B. J. (2014). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan dan Motivasi terhadap Kinerja karyawan pada PT. Bank Negara Indonesia, tbk (regional sales manado). *Acta Diurna Komunikasi*, 3(4), 1-20.
- Thompson, G., & Vecchio, R. P. (2009). Situational leadership theory: A test of three versions. *The leadership quarterly*, 20(5), 837-848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.014>
- Van Scotter, J.R., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5), 525-531. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.5.525>
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4), 216-226. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00151>
- Werner, J. (2000). Implications of OCB and contextual performance for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1), 3-24. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(99\)00036-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00036-4)
- Wilkinson, A. D., & Wagner, R. M. (1993). Supervisory leadership styles and state vocational rehabilitation counsellor job satisfaction and productivity. *Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Yoshioka, R. (2009). An Empirical Test of the Situational Leadership in Japan. Texas: *Journal of Management*.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations*, 6th ed., Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

УТИЦАЈ СТИЛА ЛИДЕРСТВА НА КОНТЕКСТУАЛНУ ПЕРФОРМАНСУ У ОРГАНИЗАЦИЈАМА У СРБИЈИ

Маја Стругар Јелача¹, Немања Бербер¹, Маја Ивановић Ђукић²,
Слободан Марић¹, Маријана Родић¹

¹Универзитет у Новом Саду, Економски факултет у Суботици, Суботица, Србија

²Универзитет у Нишу, Економски факултет, Ниш, Србија

Резиме

Карактеристике лидерства убрајају се међу значајне покретачке снаге које утичу на перформансу организације. Претходна тврдња се манифестује кроз чињеницу да лидери и запослени сарађују на вишем нивоу мотивације, стварајући већи степен поверења, лојалности и инспирације, што доводи до раста нивоа учинка који превазилази очекивања. Такође, лидери могу инспирисати запослене да искажу безусловну лојалност и оданост организацији и њеним циљевима.

Такав образац понашања повезан је са вољном посвећеношћу запослених додатним одговорностима и улогама.

Студија је обухватила 100 испитаника из највећих компанија у Републици Србији. Подаци за анализу прикупљени су путем упитника који садржи одабране вредности ставова представљене на скали посматраних карактеристика/променљивих, груписаних у оквиру истраживачке целине општег истраживачког подручја. Дизајн узорковања је првенствено узео у обзир својства основног скупа, док узорак има карактеристике случајног узорка коначног основног скупа, где је присутан дизајн узорка са понављањем и познатом вјероватноћом узорковања. Примењена је метода хијерархијске регресије како би се испитао утицај стила лидерства на контекстуалну перформансу.

Анализирајући сваки појединачни модел, можемо закључити да највећи допринос тумачењу варијансе контекстуалне перформансе везујемо за стил лидерства који је доминантно оријентисан на људе. Другим речима, већи допринос објашњавању зависних варијабли даје лидерска оријентација ка људима (подржавајући и делегирајући стил) у поређењу са стиливима и понашањем лидера оријентисаним ка задацима (усмеравање и тренирање).

Сврха овог емпиријског истраживања била је да испита однос између стила лидерства и контекстуалне перформансе. Резултати истраживања открили су да понашање лидера усмерено на односе (доминантно делегирајући стил вођења) има позитиван и значајан утицај на контекстуалну перформансу. Овај приступ је дао одговор на основно истраживачко питање, које је у вези са претпоставком да лидерско понашање оријентисано на односе (стил лидерства подршке и делегирања) има снажнији утицај на контекстуалну перформансу од понашања лидера оријентисаног на задатке (стил усмеравања и тренирања). Анализирани и презентовани резултати истраживања потврдили су обе истраживачке претпоставке, а најзначајније претпоставку да стил лидерства одређује контекстуалну перформансу у организацијама у Србији.