

Volume 2, No. 9 September 2023 - (839-852)

p-ISSN 2980-4868 | e-ISSN 2980-4841

<https://ajesh.ph/index.php/gp>



THE EFFECT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ON EMPLOYEES VOICE BEHAVIOR AT WORK PLACE

¹Shilongo Linda, ^{2*}Kiflu Chekole Tekle

Department of Management, Central China Normal University

Luoyu Road,152,Hongshan District, Whuan, China

Email : Kchekole@outlook.com

ABSTRACT:

This study aims to exploring the relationship between transformational leadership and employee voice behavior and the role of intrinsic motivation and work engagement as mediators based on social exchange theory. The survey has been used for data collection in the NamPower where 143 employees sampled for filling the questionnaires. The descriptive statistics has been used for demographic variables and association between variables has been established through Pearson correlation. Factor analysis has conducted for extracting factors. Finally, researchers use correlation and multiple linear regression analyses to authenticate our hypotheses. The results of the empirical study showed that: transformational leadership has a significant positive influence on voice behavior, intrinsic motivation and employee job engagement plays a partly mediating role between transformational leadership and employee voice behavior. Recommendations and further researches have been formulated.

Keywords: Transformational Leaderships, Voice Behavior, Engagement, Intrinsic Motivation

INTRODUCTION

World has become a global village and there has been great competition among the organizations. Thus the organization needs a transformational leader that can stimulate competitive advantage. Competitive advantage can reaped only through excellent team work that should be committed to

excellence for the success of organization. Therefore, Employee voice behavior is primordial for the achievement of the competitive advantage. Employee voice refers to informal, discretionary, and upward communication by an employee of ideas, solutions, or concerns about work-related problems (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998) ;

(Morrison, 2011). It is a type of proactive work behavior that aims to improve the status quo (Parker & Collins, 2010). Employees' voice behavior has been positively linked to desirable outcomes such as individual job performance and work unit or organizational effectiveness (Kim et al., 2010); (Frazier & Bowler, 2015) ; (Lam & Mayer, 2014); Ng and Feldman, 2012; Whiting et al., 2008). Because of the potential benefits of voice, scholars have turned their attention to promoting voice behavior in organizations (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). As leaders are usually the target for voice and their attitudes and behavior directly shapes employees' willingness to speak up (Morrison, 2014), leadership has been identified as an important factor that largely determines employees' voice behavior. In particular, transformational leadership that involves developing, supporting, and intellectually stimulating employees to strive for a shared vision of the future (Kark & Shamir, 2002); (Podsakoff et al., 1990); Moorman and Fetter, 1990) has been theorized and reported as an important antecedent of employees' voice behavior (Detert & Burris, 2007) ; (Liu et al., 2010).

The link between transformational leadership and employees' voice behavior has been examined from a cost-benefit analysis perspective and a self-concept perspective. As speaking up could bring negative personal consequences, such as jeopardized relationship and less chance of promotion (Detert & Edmondson, 2011); (Seibert et al., 2001), engaging in voice can be risky. Based on

a cost-benefit analysis perspective, (Detert & Burris, 2007) indicated that transformational leaders are more likely to cultivate employees' psychological safety, or a belief that engaging in risk-taking behaviors will not lead to personal harms (Edmondson, 1999; (Liang et al., 2012) , which alleviates negative concerns about speaking up and thus motivates employees' voice behavior. From a self-concept perspective (Knippenberg et al., 2004; Walumbwa et al., 2008), (Liu et al., 2010) indicate that transformational leaders are more likely to evoke employees' identification with the leader personally (i.e., personal identification, the extent to which the followers' beliefs about a leader become self-defining; (Kark & Shamir, 2002) and build a strong relational self that motivates employees to speak up. From this perspective, the relational link between employees and transformational leaders is the key to employees' voice behavior. However, these two perspectives only consider external reasons (i.e., consequences of voice or the relational link between employees and transformational leaders) but ignore internal reasons why transformational leadership could motivate employees' voice behavior. (Morrison, 2014) has suggested that internal reasons that drive employees to engage in voice within their work roles should be given central attention and not taken as a given in the voice process. As transformational leaders can influence followers' beliefs, values, and aims (Bass & Avolio, 1994); Howell and (Avolio et al., 1999) ; (Podsakoff et al., 1990), it is very

likely that they strengthen followers' internal commitment to take challenges and devote effort to bringing about changes (Parker & Collins, 2010), such as by making constructive suggestions.

This study predicts that the transformational leadership is one of the important elements that are necessary for the success of an organization. It is necessary for an organization to keep its workers motivated towards work because motivation is considered important for the success of an organization. However, very little literature is found at transformational leadership effect of employee voice behavior in power utility company of Namibia. Therefore, this study is going to profound the effects of transformational leadership on employee voice behavior in power utility company. To this reason from claiming consequence about association gather information from, branches, controlling offices and head offices of significant power utility in, Namibia.

RESEARCH METHODS

The researcher chose both qualitative and quantitative research design because they are both seen as they are all best that suit to provide response to the research question of the study. During the preliminary literature review, there was no much evidence and information available on transformational Leadership which has been previously investigated at all (Kell and Levin 2004; Welford, 2004). The reason that may be applicable to this is that it is a new initiative. This might also be that because

transformational leadership is a new phenomenon, there may be less interest in transformational leadership topics. Hence the scarcity of studies on transformational leadership the phenomenon is starting to attract more researchers these decades. Finally the evidence of this study will be from NamPower as a case of study. The transformational leadership survey was the instrument used to obtain the data for this study. The instrument was created by the research in consultation with my supervisor. This study was Cross-sectional study where data from the participants were collected at one specific point of time (NamPower). The independent (predictor) variable of the study was Transformational leaderships. Intrinsic motivation and work engagement were treated as mediators of transformational leaders to employee voice behavior (dependent variable). Transformational leadership was measured on charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Employee engagement was quantified as the amount of physical, cognitive, and emotional energy elicited by employees in performing their jobs (Kahn, 1992). The dependent variable of the study included employees' voice behavior. Employee voice behavior was measured as challenge-oriented, potentially risky and discretionary (Van et al., 1995). The variables were continuous variables and there was no unit of measurement used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data analysis

The participants’ scores were keyed into the SPSS to perform preliminary analysis. In the preliminary analysis, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations were obtained for the variables of interest. Factor analysis has been performed to extract factors. Moreover, normality, outliers, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multi-collinearity were checked to ensure that these assumptions were not violated. Pearson correlations were generated to demonstrate the correlations between the independent variable, mediators and dependent variable.

After the preliminary analysis, the Linear multiple regression analysis was conducted whereby the main effects of the independent and mediator variables on employee voice behavior were tested, followed by testing the interaction effect of transformational

leadership on intrinsic motivation and on work engagement and finally on employee voice behavior. To perform all statistics, data entry first and statistical analysis has been done using SPSS 24.0 statistical software package. The findings presented in this chapter also provide the demographic characteristics of Nampower employees (respondents to the survey).

Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Data from the demographic part of the questionnaire yielded information about surveyed employees’ age, gender, and education background, civil status, working experiences and branches where they are currently working. Table 1 presents a summary of the key statistics in this data. The respondents in this study were 143 NamPower professional employees working into 4 branches including headquarter in Namibia.

**Table 1
Respondents Demographic Data**

Demographic variables	Frequency(N)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	78	54.5
Female	65	45.5
Age		
18-24 years old	15	10.5
25-31 years old	29	20.3
32-38 years old	45	31.5
39-45 years old	41	28.7
46 and above old	13	9.1
Marital status		
Single	55	38.5

Married	88	61.5
Working experience		
Less than 5 years	10	7.0
5years -10years	74	51.7
Above 10 years	59	41.3
Education background		
Grade 12 certificate	32	22.4
Bachelors degree	42	29.4
Masters	18	12.6
PhD	8	5.6
Others	43	30.1

N=143

Gender distribution

In order to avoid biasness, this study had to investigate the composition of the respondents in terms of gender distribution. The table 1 discloses that the survey sample was dominated by male employees, 54.5% (n=78) compared to female, 45.5% (n=65). A further analysis indicates that male employee dominated their female counterparts in nearly all age groups, with exception of the employees who are 32 years and below.

Participant's distribution by age

In this study, employees' ages were grouped into five categories, namely: lower age group (18-24 years), lower middle age-group (25 to 31), upper middle age-group (32 to 38 years) and upper- age group (39-45 years) and upper age-group (46 years and above). The results presented in the table 1 indicate that the majority of the employees 60.2% (n=86) were equally distributed between the upper middle age groups: 32 and

38 years; and lower aged group 39 and 45 years. Nearly 62% are 38 years and below, while nearly 38% were above 38 years.

Further, the researcher checked the distribution of participants by age and by gender. Considering gender distribution by age wise 5.59% were male and 4.90% were female aged 18-24 years old, 11.89 % were male and 8.39% were female aged 25-31 years old, 13.29% were male and 18.18% were female aged 32-38 years old, 16.08% were male and 12.59% were female aged 39-45 years old and finally 7.69% were male and 1.4% were female aged 46 and above. From the observation, most of the staff of Nampower are still young and female are younger than male.

Distribution of participants by gender and by marital status

The survey indicated that the majority (nearly 62%) of the employees were married. Nearly 38% were single. Among married 55% (n=49) are male while female are 45% (n=39).

Further comparison of the marital status and age of the surveyed employees, shows that the majority (45) of the married employees were between 32 and 38 years, and some (54) married employees were 39 and above. 12 married employees were under 31 years. Most (18) single employees were aged between 32 and 38 years.

Participants distribution by level of education

In order to avoid biasness, this study had to investigate the composition of the respondents in terms of education level to understand their familiarity with these concept of transformational leadership and employee

voice behavior and familiarity with company. This study considered five levels of qualification, namely: PhD, masters, bachelors (A0), and grade 12 certificate and others: (diploma (A1) and advanced certificate (A2). The survey found that nearly 31% possess other degrees or certificates as the NamPower require more technical vocational certificate than general education certificate. Based on education level, among all respondents, 22.4% had a grade 12 school certificate, 29.4% had a bachelor degree, nearly 13% had Masters' degree, and nearly 6% had PhD degrees and 30% other certificates.

Employees voice behavior distribution in term of demographic characteristics

Gender difference has been examined in term of voice behavior

Table 2
Gender Distribution in Term of Employee Voice Behavior (t-Test)

Employee voice behavior	Independent Sample t-test for male and female		N	df	p
	n	and			
Employee voice behavior	Equal variances assumed		3.177	141	.002
	Equal variances not assumed		3.124	124.36	.002

*p<0.05

The table 2 shows a significant difference between NamPower employees voice behavior in term of gender (DF=141, t=3.177, p< 0.05) at CI 95%. More specifically, male NamPower employees scored slightly higher (M= 3.9, SD=0.79) than female (M= 3.4 SD=0.9). Similarly to the prior research has

documented that gender influences employees' voice behavior, with a possibility that females are less likely to speak up than males (Morrison, 2011) ; Tangirala et al., 2013). In this study there is a significant statistical difference (p<0.05) in the genders in term of voice behavior and male are more

assumed to speak up than female in NamPower.

Table 3
Distribution of Voice Behavior in Term Of Civil Status

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	4.155	1	4.155	5.268	.023
Within Groups	111.209	141	.789		
Total	115.364	142			

*p<0.05

A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to find out whether there was any statistical significant difference in Nampower employees voice behavior in relation to their civil status ages. The overall ANOVA test

revealed a significant difference, $F(1,141) = 5.26$, $p = 0.023$. More specifically, married employees speak up more ($M=3.83$, $SD=.98$) than single employees ($M=3.48$, $SD=.85$).

Table 4
Distribution of Voice Behavior in Term Of Education Background (ANOVA)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10.955	4	2.739	3.620	.008
Within Groups	104.409	138	.757		
Total	115.364	142			

*p<0.05

A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to find out whether there was any statistical significant difference in Nampower employees voice behavior in relation to their education background. The overall ANOVA test revealed a significant difference, $F(4,138) = 3.620$, $p < 0.05$ (Table 7). The Post Hoc- Tests of Dennett's C showed that there is a significant

difference in different level of qualifications By controlling Bachelors degree holders and compared to the rest (Dennett (>control), there is a significant difference in employee voice behavior bachelors > PhD > Masters > high school certificate > others. More specifically, Bachelors degree holders' employees speak up more than others.

Exploratory factor analysis

Before testing and verification of our hypotheses researchers conducted factor analysis procedures to examine the measurement model fit and the distinctiveness among our study variables. The responses from the survey instrument have to be subjected to the exploratory analysis using Principal components with a Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. This method was incorporated to provide evidence of validity as well as to define the dimensions of the variables in construct validity. The analysis was executed to test whether or not the underlying structures of each variable were found. In addition, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was executed to measure if the sample size was large enough to execute a stable factor analysis (adequacy). The KMO statistic varies between 0 and 1. Each variable in this study should score a minimum of 0.8 on the KMO measurement, where a value of 1 indicates that patterns of correlations are relatively compact and factor analysis should yield distinct and reliable factors (Field, 2012). Finally, it was checked if each item within a variable had an individual factor loading above 0.3. Results of the test show that correlated items of the survey consisting of 45 questions that were gathered under the same and factor

analysis and Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization method which is the method of dimension reduction were used to simplify the analysis and to provide evidence of validity as well as to define the dimensions of the variables in construct validity. First of all, the result of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (KMO) which measures the sampling adequacy among the samples is 72%. And Bartlett's Test of Sphericity shows that p-value is less than 0.05. [$\chi^2 (153) = 1405.970, p < 0.05$]. As this value of KMO is near 1 and as p-value is below 0.05, the sample size has been interpreted to be adequate. As a result of the factor analysis applied, 4 factors whose Eigen values are (Transformation leadership, intrinsic motivation, working engagement and employee voice behaviors) have been found out. Total variance explained value of these dimensions has been taken into account. Total variance explained by 53.0% of the total variance. Moreover, the employee Job Engagement was explained with share of 27.6% and this shows that this factor is the most important one among the other factors followed by transformational leadership 10.2%.

Table 5
Total Variance Explained Value of Factors

<i>Factors (dimensions)</i>	<i>Eigenvalues</i>	<i>Variance explained</i>	<i>Cumulative variance explained</i>
Work engagement	6.80	27.21	27.21
Transformational leadership	2.56	10.27	37.49
Employee intrinsic motivation	2.15	8.62	46.11
Employee voice behavior	1.73	6.94	53.06

From the analysis of the table, some items have been omitted or deleted from the analysis because they were loaded in two factors and their communalities were below 0.30. Finally, 25 items were significantly loaded into 4 factors, which represent evidence to the construct validity for instrument. The underlying dimensions of factors that remained and identified have been submitted to the retest for reliability. The Cronbach alpha coefficient (α) for working engagement was 0.85, transformational leadership was 0.80, employee intrinsic motivation was 0.84 and finally employee voice behavior was 0.88 that is why the data collected using the questionnaire has provided valuable information about the opinions of employees about the variables. After examining the principal component

analysis, a 4factor solutions were retained, which provided the best simple structure and confirm the results from the table of total variance explained. Eigen values of all 4factors are greater than 1.

Pearson correlation analysis: association between variables in the study

The theoretical model of this study comprises two parts: discussions on the effect of the independent variable (transformational leadership) on the potential dependent variables (employee voice behavior) second the influence of the dependent variables on the potential dependent variables. All variables have been tested for correlation, by using Pearson product moment correlation and the results are displayed in the table 6 below.

Table 6
Mean, Standard deviation and correlation (n=143)

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Age	3.06	1.13	1							
2.Marital status	1.62	.48	.56**	1						
3.Education background	2.95	1.60	.16*	-.05	1					
4.Working experience	11.5	8.59	.64**	.30**	.35**	1				
5.Transformational leadership	3.68	.70	-.05	.22**	-.06	-.04	(.80)			
6.Employee intrinsic motivation	3.71	.83	-.04	.17*	-.07	-.14	.61**	(.84)		
7.Employee work engagement	3.72	.82	-.01	.23**	-.13	-.07	.72**	.67**	(.85)	
8.Employee voice behavior	3.70	.90	-.04	.19*	-.05	-.07	.72**	.61**	.67**	(.88)

*** Correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed),*correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)*

M: Mean, SD: Stand deviation. Cronbach alpha

Correlation coefficients between the variables in this study are shown in the table 6. Researchers controlled for age, education level, and marital status as previous studies suggested they might be associated with the mediators and outcomes in our model. For instance, marital status is significantly correlated with work experience ($r=.30$, $p<.01$), transformational leadership ($r=.22$, $p<.01$), intrinsic motivation ($r=.17$, $p<.05$), work engagement ($r=.23$, $p<.01$), and with employee voice behavior ($r=.19$, $p<.05$). Further, the results show the inter-correlation

between the demographic variables, age was correlated with working experience, marital status and education level. The results to the research show most of the married people don't like to speak up their opinions compared to the singles. The results are in contrast to the results of Johnson and Schulman, 1989) who find that males were more likely to display voice behavior than female employees with senior tenure in their job may feel more comfortable speaking up than newcomers (Stamper and Van Dyne, 2001), education and age may also increase an individuals' level of

confidence that he or she possess the skills and knowledge necessary to make suggestions and speak up (Farr & West, 1990). As illustrated by the table, all relations among the research variables were in the same direction, as predicted. For the hypotheses, significant correlations were found between transformational leadership (predictor variable) and employee voice behavior through mediators' employee intrinsic motivation and work engagement. As demonstrated by the table there is a strong positive statistical significant between independent variable (transformational leadership and dependent variable (employee voice behavior) as shown by ($r=.72, p<.01$). There is further a statistical significant association between transformation leadership and mediator employee intrinsic motivation ($r=.61, p<.01$). Transformation leadership is also significantly correlated with employee engagement at ($r=.72, p<.01$). In additional, Intrinsic motivation was also significantly correlated with employee work engagement ($r=.67, p<.01$), and employee work engagement was also correlated with employee voice behavior ($r=.67, p<.01$). Therefore, these results consistent and support our hypothesis. Meaning that H1, H2, H3, H4 have been confirmed. The findings are in line with two survey studies found that transformational leadership was positively associated with employees' willingness to speak up to their leader (Detert & Burris, 2007). Transformational leadership was also

positively related to employees' innovation behavior and creativity (Shin & Zhou, 2003). It is, therefore, proposed that transformational leadership is positively relative to employees' voice behavior. In addition, (Jung et al., 1995) showed that transformational leadership could play a critical role in enhancing employee effectiveness by encouraging employee engagement. Similarly to the findings of (Detert & Burris, 2007) ; Zhu and Yang, 2010 stated that the Transformational leadership has been theorized and reported as an important antecedent of employees' voice behavior. Further, correspondingly to the work of (Morrison, 2014), leaders are usually the target for voice and their attitudes and behavior directly shapes employees' willingness to speak up (Morrison, 2014), leadership has been identified as an important factor that largely determines employees' voice behavior. The literature on leadership suggests that a transformative leader can integrate the common aspirations and needs of organizational members, allowing them to feel the importance of their work. Transformative leaders can activate service employees' self-affirmation and identification with their organization, thereby encouraging them to make additional efforts to achieve work outcomes that exceed expectations. Further, the findings are in line with (Schaufeli et al., 2002) results, noted that engaged employees tend to feel greater attachment to their organization. The transformational leadership associated with employee voice

behavior might be explained more completely by examining the mediator of intrinsic motivation and employee engagement, as transformational leadership seems an indirect vehicle for advancing powerful criteria for employee voice behavior. Furthermore, (Darshan, 2011) also found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and subordinate job satisfaction in their studies. It can also be concluded that employ motivation is a key to success for every organization and employ motivation can be achieved through transformational and charismatic leadership.

Results of regression analysis

To respond to the research questions and the hypothesis, this study made use of multiple linear regression analysis after all the necessary assumptions had been met to show the value of each of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The multiple regressions assessed the relationship of predictive variables on a criterion variable. The results are displayed below in the table 7 :

Table 7
The Direct and Indirect Effects of Transformational Leadership on Various Potential Variables

Predictors	β1	β2	β3	β4	β5	β6	β7
Demographic variable							
Intercept	3.271	.235	.937	.579	1.193	-.014	-.016
Age	-.184	.010	.074	.022	-.066	.040	.037
Marital status	.310*	.049	.056	.080	.153	.005	.029
Education background	.011	.017	.027	-.066	-.082	-.026	-.058
Working experience	-.053	-.069	-.195	-.057	.014	-.014	-.016
Predictor variable							
Transformational leadership		.71**		.70*			.48**
			.60*			.54**	
Mediator variables							
Intrinsic motivation					.63*	.26**	

Employee work engagement							.31**
R ²	.07	.52	.40	.54	.46	.57	
F	2.593*	30.56**	18.52*	32.55**	25.1*	30.13*	30.53*
			*		*	*	*

*p <0.05, **p<0.01

β1: demographic variable, β2: employee voice behavior, β3: intrinsic motivation, β4: employee engagement, β5: employee voice behavior, β6: employee voice behavior, β7: employee voice behavior

The Table 7 displays the result of the regression test of how much transformational leadership is affect employees' voice, and intrinsic motivation and work engagement as mediators between transformational leadership and employees' voice. The results will be explained according to the 7models:

1. Regression of demographic variables to employee voice behavior

The regression analysis was made to determine the effects of demographic variable to employee voice behavior. The model obtained was statistically significant, R²=.07, F (4,138) =2.593, p<.05. The value of 7% shows that there is a weak significant positive linear relationship between demographic variable and employee voice behavior. Furthermore, the results also show that only marital status explains 31% proportion of variation in employee voice behavior.

2. The direct effects of transformation leadership to employee voice behavior

The regression analysis was made to determine the direct effects of transformation leadership to employee voice behavior. The model obtained was statistically significant, R²=.52, F (5,136) =30.56, p<.01. The value of 52% shows that there is a significant positive linear relationship between transformation leader and to employee voice behavior. However, the model shows that there is no relationship between demographic factors and employee voice behavior. Furthermore, the results also show that transformation leaderships explain 71% proportion of variation in employee voice behavior. Thus, the significant positive association between transformational leadership and employee voice behavior (β=.71, p<.01), thus verified and confirmed hypothesis number 1(H1). In addition the higher the transformation

leaders higher were motivating the employee to speak up. Remember that the employee voice is unique in that it is considered both theoretically and empirically distinct from other extra-role behaviors (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998) : Tangirala and Ramanujam, 2008). It exists as a means for employees to exert influence with the goal of improving their work environment. This findings are in line with the results of (Detert & Burris, 2007) ; (Liu et al., 2010), stated that supervisors play a major role in promoting voice behavior. Furthermore, when supervisors show interest in employee suggestions through an accommodating attitude and behavior, followers' psychological safety will be enhanced, making them more comfortable about voicing suggestions to their supervisors, as openness in management reduces the power gap between supervisors and followers lower in employees' perception of the cost of the risk of voicing suggestions (Edmondson, 2003). The same line with (Bass, 1985) who sated that transformational characteristics are highly correlated and higher-order construct (Liang et al., 2012) ; Walumbwa et al., 2008), transformational leaders can alter their followers' values and integrate them into their work goals or stimulate their potential based on the above behaviors, thereby helping them exceed expectations (Yukl, 2002). As a result, followers become more involved with the leader's vision and are willing to sacrifice for that vision (House and Howell, 1992).Transformational leaders

intellectually inspire employees to view old problems from new viewpoints, giving them more buffers in interaction and challenging the current situation (Avolio et al., 1999)

3. Transformational leadership effect to intrinsic motivation

The regression was preformed and the results find the model to be significant $R^2=.40$, $F(5,136)=18.52$, $p<.01$. The value of 40% shows that there is a significant positive linear relationship between transformation leader and to intrinsic motivation. However, the model shows that there is no relationship between demographic factors and intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, the results also show that transformation leaderships explain 60% proportion of variation in intrinsic motivation. The results also show that transformational leadership was positively and significant associated with intrinsic motivation ($\beta=.60$, $p<.01$), thus verified and confirmed hypothesis number 2(H2).

4. Transformational leadership effect to work engagement

The regression was preformed and the results find the model to be significant $R^2=.54$ $F(5,136)=32.55$, $p<.01$. The value of 54 percent shows a greatly significant positive linear association between transformation leadership and employee work engagement. However, the model shows that there is no relationship between demographic factors and employee work engagement. The results also show that transformational leadership was positively

and significant associated with work engagement ($\beta=.70$, $p<.01$), thus confirmed hypothesis number 3(H3). These mean that transformation leaderships explain 70% proportion of variation in employee work engagement.

5. Intrinsic motivation and work engagement (H4)

The regression analysis was made to determine the direct effects of intrinsic motivation to work engagement. The model obtained was statistically significant, $R^2=.47$, $F(5,137) = 25.176$, $p<.01$. The value of 47% shows that there is a significant positive linear relationship between intrinsic motivations to working engagement. The results also show that intrinsic motivation was positively and significant associated with work engagement ($\beta=.63$, $p<.01$), thus confirmed hypothesis number 4(H4). The study is in line with the study of Low and Robertson, (2006) stated that intrinsic motivation is important in company because it is a vital currency for a company's survival and success. For instance, giving praise and recognition makes employees feel respected and appreciated and will hence produce good results in their jobs. Praise and recognition will increase one's self-efficacy through verbal persuasion, making them more confident in their ability to perform their job. When a manager provides care and concern for an employee facing personal challenges, the employee will be better able to focus on his work tasks once his personal problems have been

resolved. Therefore, employees will be more engaged and committed to a firm that cares for their needs and their well-being and gives employees a sense of ownership into what they do, as indicated by Dan Ariely. In NamPower employees will be tasked with different situations everyday and may end up questioning the purpose of their jobs. Hence, in such a service environment, a high level of job engagement is needed, which is the investment of an employee's physical, cognitive and emotional energies into job performance (Robbins et al., 2013). When an employee is highly engaged in her job, she believes it is meaningful to engage in it and because the organization's values are similar to the employees, where employees with the same values are working together.

6. Mediating the effect of intrinsic motivation to transformational leadership on employee voice behavior

The regression analysis was made to determine the mediating effect of intrinsic motivation to transformation leadership on employee voice behavior. The model obtained was statistically significant, $R^2=.57$, $F(6,136) = 30.134$, $p<.01$. The value of 57% shows that there is a significant positive linear relationship between transformation leader and to employee voice behavior. However, the model shows that there is no relationship between demographic factors and employee voice behavior. The results also show that mediator intrinsic motivation was positively and significant associated with

transformational leadership and employee voice behavior ($\beta=.26$, $p<.01$) at the same time as transformational leadership is positively associated with employee voice behavior through mediator intrinsic motivation ($\beta=.54$, $p<.01$), thus confirmed hypothesis number 5(H5).

7. Mediating the effect of working engagement on transformational leadership to employee voice behavior

The table 7 shows the regression analysis results and it was made to determine the mediating effect of work engagement to transformation leadership on employee voice behavior. The model obtained was statistically significant, $R^2=.57$, $F(6,136)=30.53$, $p<.01$. The value of 57% shows that there is a significant positive linear relationship between mediator work engagements to transformation leadership on employee voice behavior. The results also show that mediator work engagement was positively and significant associated with transformational leadership and employee voice behavior ($\beta=.31$, $p<.01$) while transformational leadership was positively associated with employee voice behavior ($\beta=.48$, $p<.01$), thus confirmed hypothesis number 6(H6). The study results are in line with the study conducted by (Chen et al., 2005) demonstrated that there is a positive relationship between employee voice and work engagement in Taiwan. Research conducted on work engagement has shown that highly engaged employees become more

committed to the organization, thus leading to increased job satisfaction, lower absenteeism and turnover rates, improved health and well-being, more extra-role behaviors, higher performance and a greater exhibition of personal initiatives, proactive behavior and learning motivation (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). In the same line with the results of the study of Avolio et al. (1999) they noted that transformational leadership embodied characteristics of being charismatic and influential in their ability to make employees do more than what was expected of them at work. Similarly, Bass (1985) suggested that employees were more likely to devote additional extra effort at work, if they reported to a transformational leader who guided their employees by motivating them and inspiring their trust. Correspondingly to the work of Long-zeng Wu (2011) who finds that transformational leadership has a significant positive correlation with voice behavior through empirical research. In the same way as (Milliken et al., 2003) finds that transformational leadership can inspire employees to pay beyond the expectations of efforts by establishing mutual trust, while voice behavior is one of the behaviors beyond the organizations' expectations to employees.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the supervisors' transformational leadership encourages employees to voice suggestions in NamPower organization operating in Namibia. The aim of the study was to assess the effect of transformational leadership on employee voice behavior. Methodologically, this study mainly used the quantitative approach. The survey was used for collecting primary data and all questionnaires have been constructed using the Likert scale items while secondary data were gathered through documentary analysis, especially those related to the company profile and literature review. Regarding the findings, the study established that transformational leadership practices were perceived to have varying forms of high impact on employee voice behavior which will positively impact the outcomes and organizational performance. This result provides empirical evidence that the goal of voice is an important variable when employees are deciding whether to speak out their opinions, their ideas, and judgments. It was also found that transformational leadership had significant positive effects on employees' intrinsic motivation, work engagement and voice behaviors as demonstrated by Pearson correlation test and multiple regressions by confirming the hypothesis of the study. This finding strengthens the point that supervisors play a most important role in promoting employee voice behavior. As stated by Bass,

(1985); Howell and (Avolio et al., 1999) ; (Podsakoff et al., 1990) transformational leaders can influence followers' beliefs, values, and aims. It is very likely that they strengthen followers' internal commitment to take challenges and devote effort to bringing about changes (Parker & Wu, 2014) such as by making beneficial proposal. As teams become more important in many organizations, today's leaders face a challenging balancing act. On the one hand, they need to develop and motivate individual followers so as to ensure that each employee is capable of, and willing to, complete his or her own tasks; on the other hand, they need to facilitate collaboration and build trust among team members so that the team functions effectively as a whole. Overcoming this challenge requires as a practice of extra-role behavior such that it has the potential to "contribute to organizational effectiveness in ways that shape the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the promoter for task activities and processes" (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Employee voice as an informal process is accompanied by speaking up and may involve "championing ideas, providing constructive feedback, engagement with management in meaningful ways, taking charge, issue selling, and making constructive suggestions-all of which result in having an reliable say about organizational practices" (Kassing, 2011). This study attempted to enlarge previous research by exploring the relationships among transformational

leadership, intrinsic motivation, work engagement and voice behaviors from a multilevel perspective. NamPower can better realize the influence of transformational leadership on employees and the significance of workplace context on employee voice behavior.

BIBLIOGRAFI

- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441–462.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. sage.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99–109.
- Chen, Z. X., Aryee, S., & Lee, C. (2005). Test of a mediation model of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(3), 457–470.
- Darshan, G. (2011). Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate job satisfaction in leather companies in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Business Management and Economic Research*, 2(5), 284–296.
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869–884.
- Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 461–488.
- Farr, J. L., & West, M. A. (1990). *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies*. Wiley.
- Frazier, M. L., & Bowler, W. M. (2015). Voice climate, supervisor undermining, and work outcomes: A group-level examination. *Journal of Management*, 41(3), 841–863.
- Jung, D. I., Bass, B. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1995). Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(4), 3–18.
- Kahn, W. A. (1992). To Be Fully There: Psychological Presence at Work. *Human Relations*, 45(4), 321–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679204500402>
- Kark, R., & Shamir, B. (2002). THE INFLUENCE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ON FOLLOWERS' RELATIONAL VERSUS COLLECTIVE SELF-CONCEPT. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2002(1), D1–D6.
- Kassing, J. (2011). *Dissent in organizations* (Vol. 4). Polity.
- Kim, J., MacDuffie, J. P., & Pil, F. K. (2010). Employee voice and organizational performance: Team versus representative influence. *Human Relations*, 63(3), 371–394.
- Lam, C. F., & Mayer, D. M. (2014). When do employees speak up for their

- customers? A model of voice in a customer service context. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(3), 637–666.
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 853.
- Liang, J., Farh, C. I. C., & Farh, J.-L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71–92.
- Liu, W., Zhu, R., & Yang, Y. (2010). I warn you because I like you: Voice behavior, employee identifications, and transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(1), 189–202.
- Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453–1476.
- Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 373–412.
- Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.*, 1(1), 173–197.
- Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 706–725.
- Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36(3), 633–662.
- Parker, S. K., & Wu, C. (2014). 18 Leading for Proactivity: How Leaders Cultivate Staff Who Make Things Happen. *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*, 380.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142.
- Robbins, S., Judge, T. A., Millett, B., & Boyle, M. (2013). *Organisational behaviour*. Pearson Higher Education AU.
- 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.
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(4), 845–874.
- Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 703–714.

Copyright holder:

Shilongo Linda, Kiflu Chekole Tekle (2023)

First publication right:

Asian Journal of Engineering, Social and Health (AJESH)

This article is licensed under:

