

SYMBIOTIC MANAGERIAL SPIRAL OF MOTIVATION AND KEY PROCESSES OF HUMAN POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Martina Blašková – Rudolf Blaško – Kristína Tršková

Abstract

The paper examines relationships between the motivation as the most important process affecting the quality of work behaviors and other crucial processes of the systematic human potential development. Based on a sociological questioning conducted on a sample of 2,626 respondents, an analytical part presents results confirming the dependency of work motivation intensity on the selected processes quality. As crucial processes we mark especially the creative leadership, objective work performance appraisal, open communication, and building a suitable work atmosphere. We assume consequently that the intensity of motivation achieved (due to high or poor quality of the processes considered) can backwardly act to a stronger dynamization and future better quality of these processes. This means the process of motivate individuals and groups creates a unique symbiotic (causal) relationship with every crucial process of the human potential development. Mutual acceleration effects of the motivating and considered human potential processes means that the motivation is affected by processes and processes are affected by motivation. Mentioned impacts and movements might generate a symbiotic motivational-process spiral. This spiral can act not only in relation to the processes of human potential development but also in relation to other professional business processes: production, marketing, finance, logistics, development, etc.

Key words: motivation, human potential, leadership, communication, symbiosis

JEL Code: M12 – Personnel Management

Introduction

Motivation is the most substantial force of existing organizations and determines their effective operation. This term has many various meanings, wherein always affects (positively or negatively) the future success or failure of individuals and groups (Čandík & Jedinák, 2016; Faletar & Jelačić, 2016; Campbell, 2006; Fry, 2003, etc.). It can refer variously to the goals individuals have, the ways in which individuals chose their goals and the ways in which others try to change their behavior (Armstrong, 2009, p. 317). Based on knowledge the human (work or social) motivation is permanently attacked by various objective (organizational and

external) or subjective (psychical, private or other) powers, it has to be systematically strengthened and harmonized with the motivations of all the touched individuals, groups, or interests. All these subjects have to be motivated. From this viewpoint, motivating the individuals or groups can be understood as an influential process targeted to act upon the motivation. More concretely, Igielski (2015) defines this one as a complex process in which one should regard the diagnosis as a point of departure of individual needs of every person and taking diverse paces aiming at satisfying them (p. 77). Naturally, the process of motivating, through its wide net of various correlations, reciprocities, influences, elements, procedures, tools, opportunities, barriers, etc., is firmly connected with other processes of the human potential development.

Based on a theoretical and practical analysis and synthesis, *an intention of paper* is to highlight the interlinkages that exist between the motivation and crucial HPD processes, and define the concept of symbiotic motivation-process spirals. The results of our survey serve as a support for the existence of these symbiotic spirals. Spirals confirms the strong dependence of motivation achieved on the quality of applied leadership style, performance appraisal fairness, communication openness, and building an atmosphere of trust. Making use the proven correlations between the motivation and the processes explored, we try to theoretically define the symbiotic spirals existing also among these HPD processes. Later we even define such a spiral in relation to other business processes (production, logistics, financial, marketing, etc.).

1 Motivation in relation to processes of human potential development

Human activities are motivated by one or many very complicated factors known and unknown (Faletar & Jelačić, 2016). When relating motivation to the processes of *leadership* and *performance appraisal*, the intrinsic motivation partially mediates the impact of transformational leadership on the employees' creativity (Shin & Zhou, 2003) while trust, built through a leader, enhances performance between individuals, within and among groups, and in organizations (Hurley, 2011). When relating motivation to the *communication* and *building the positive atmosphere*, a satisfactory organization outcome requires coordination among the participants, and coordination requires information transmission (through effective and open communication) and motivation (Campbell, 2006).

On the other hand, the content and perspectives of *manager's motivational influence* are dominant. From this viewpoint, basic predeterminations, intentions, and harmonization

result of the egoism versus pro-social managerial behavior have to be considered. According to Ismail et al. (2012), motivational motives versus punishment motives are often applied. The motivational motives give out high performance ratings in order to stimulate, direct, and appraise actions to achieve goals. The punishment motives assign low performance ratings in order to punish employees (appraises) who have committed misconducts in order to correct their faults as well as increase their work ethics.

We should take into account a fact that there exists a *strong dependence* (as the results of our survey) between the level of perceived motivation and the key processes of human potential development. On the one hand, the achieved motivation of managers, HR professionals and employees *determines* the content, quality, methods used, outputs, and impacts of all crucial processes of HPD. Employees and managers need to be motivated to as best as possible course of these processes. On the other hand, these processes can be seen as *procedural motivational tools* that build and strengthen the motivation in organization. The quality of these processes affects fundamentally the level of motivation and its contents. If the strengthening of work or social motivations is considered, the HPD processes are irreplaceable. If a slight dampening of a too strong motivation – ‘over-motivation’ – is considered, the processes can serve as a regulatory force. They regulate the direction in which it is desired for a well-being of individuals, groups, and organizations. Furthermore, if the direction change of the expressed motivation – ‘re-motivation’ – is considered, the processes can take an inspirational, guidance, but also to some extent, power or restrictive influence.

Always, however, the relationship between the motivation and the crucial HPD processes is *essential, both-side, and gradational*. This means the process of motivating creates a *unique symbiotic (causal) relationship* with every of HPD processes. HPD processes depend on the motivation, and vice-versa, motivation depends on these processes. In other words, this myriad of symbioses permanently reinforces their progress and thus also the expected results, i.e. both the intensity of subsequent (further and further) motivations and the quality of all (further and further) crucial HPD processes. Depending on the embedded managerial efforts as well achievements of motivate and other processes of the HPD, a *qualitative spiral movement* is created in this way. This one can be directed both upwards and downwards. This means that the *symbiotic motivation-process spirals* can accelerate but also negate the organization action.

2 Sociology survey

In order to obtain relevant information on the motivation and the most important aspect touched with it, we decided perform a sociological survey in Slovak organization in the winter 2016. With regard to the topic of this paper, our attention is now concentrated to the searching intensity of motivation, style of leadership applied toward the employees, quality (openness) of the communication, fairness (objectivity) of the performance appraisal, creativeness of the organizational atmosphere, willingness to increase work performance, etc. The survey covered 2,626 respondents: 1,084 (41.28%) male and 1,542 (58.72%) female. Average age was 36.10 years for male and 33.57 for female. There were 2,067 (78.71%) employees (799 male and 1,268 female) and 559 (21.29%) managers (285 male and 274 female).

In one of the initial questions, we were interested in the *quality of leadership style*. We asked employees how they are led by their manager. Managers were questioned how they lead their employees. Responses options were as follows: participative, neutral, and autocratic. Comparisons of the employees' expressions and/versus managers' expressions are in Table 1.

Tab 1. Applied style of leadership: expressions of employees versus managers

	Employees (2,067 = 78.71% of all)						Managers (559 = 21.29% of all)					
	All 2,067=100%		Male 799=100%		Female 1268=100%		All 559=100%		Male 285=100%		Female 274=100%	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Participative	1,038	50.22	388	48.56	650	51.26	437	78.18	220	77.19	217	79.20
Neutral	673	32.56	276	34.54	397	31.31	88	15.74	42	14.74	46	16.79
Autocratic	356	17.22	135	16.90	221	17.43	34	6.08	23	8.07	11	4.01

As we can see, more than three quarters of managers (78.18%) claim that they lead employees by the participation. Only 8.6% of them state they use the autocracy. However, only half (50.22%) of employees confirm the participatory and up to 17.22% give the autocracy.

The following questions have devoted to examining whether: a) employees and managers consider *the evaluation of their work as objective and fair*; b) consider *communication as open*; c) *atmosphere of trust and belonging* prevails in the workplace (Table 2). For all the questions we have chosen a Likert 5-point scale, i.e. 5 points = yes; 4 points = mostly yes; 3 points = average; 2 points = mostly not; 1 point = no. Table shows

that only 74.49% of employees considered appraisal as wholly or mostly objective and just 6.21% as mostly unfair. Linked to this is the fact that 74.07% of employees consider communication as wholly or mostly open and 73.53% of employees evaluate positively the atmosphere.

The next question asked at what level is the *motivation* of respondents (Table 3) to four motivation dimensions or targets. These dimensions were as follows: quality of the work done; increase the level of knowledge and skills; submission of new ideas and increase the process efficiency; and creative collaboration and motivate employees. Likert scale: high level (5), rather high (4), average (3), rather lower (2), low (1).

Tab 2. Appraisal objectiveness, communication openness, atmosphere of trust

	Appraisal objectiveness			Communication openness			Atmosphere of trust		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
	2,626	1,084	1,542	2,626	1,084	1,542	2,626	1,084	1,542
Yes	28.29%	28.87%	27.89%	34.77%	36.25%	33.72%	36.82%	36.81%	36.84%
Mostly yes	46.19%	46.13%	46.24%	39.30%	39.58%	39.11%	36.71%	38.65%	35.34%
Averagely	19.31%	18.91%	19.58%	19.15%	18.27%	19.78%	18.74%	17.16%	19.84%
Mostly no	4.57%	4.15%	4.86%	4.95%	4.34%	5.38%	5.56%	5.26%	5.77%
No	1.64%	1.94%	1.43%	1.83%	1.57%	2.01%	2.17%	2.12%	2.20%
(Mostly) yes (4–5p.)	74.49%	75.00%	74.12%	74.07%	75.83%	72.83%	73.53%	75.46%	72.18%
Averagely (3p.)	19.31%	18.91%	19.58%	19.15%	18.27%	19.78%	18.74%	17.16%	19.84%
(Mostly) no (1–2p.)	6.21%	6.09%	6.29%	6.78%	5.90%	7.39%	7.73%	7.38%	7.98%
Mean	3.95	3.96	3.94	4	4.05	3.97	4	4.03	3.99
Upper q.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Median	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Lower q.	3	3.5	3	3	4	3	3	4	3

Tab 3. Intensity of motivation for basic motivational targeting

	To quality of work done			To improving skills			To new suggestions			To cooperate + motivate		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
	2,626	1,084	1,542	2,626	1,084	1,542	2,626	1,084	1,542	2,626	1,084	1,542
High	42.50%	40.04%	44.23%	31.53%	30.17%	32.49%	18.09%	20.20%	16.60%	23.34%	22.51%	23.93%
Rather high	39.22%	40.77%	38.13%	42.16%	42.53%	41.89%	40.44%	39.58%	41.05%	40.21%	41.70%	39.17%
Average	14.20%	14.85%	13.75%	20.41%	20.39%	20.43%	30.85%	29.70%	31.65%	27.61%	26.57%	28.34%
Rather low	2.93%	3.23%	2.72%	4.27%	4.89%	3.83%	7.46%	7.20%	7.65%	6.05%	6.64%	5.64%
Low	1.14%	1.11%	1.17%	1.64%	2.03%	1.36%	3.16%	3.32%	3.05%	2.78%	2.58%	2.92%
High (4–5)	81.72%	80.81%	82.36%	73.69%	72.69%	74.38%	58.53%	59.78%	57.65%	63.56%	64.21%	63.10%

Average (3)	14.20%	14.85%	13.75%	20.41%	20.39%	20.43%	30.85%	29.70%	31.65%	27.61%	26.57%	28.34%
Low (1–2)	4.07%	4.34%	3.89%	5.90%	6.92%	5.19%	10.62%	10.52%	10.70%	8.83%	9.23%	8.56%
Mean	4.19	4.15	4.22	3.98	3.94	4	3.63	3.66	3.61	3.75	3.75	3.76
Upper q.	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
Median	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Lower q.	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

We then compared the *relations of HPD processes on the intensity of perceived motivation*: i.e. leadership styles (only in the group of employees; in other issues we considered also the managers), appraisal, communication, and atmosphere. We set the null hypothesis H0: The probability that the motivation (to quality work, skills increase, etc.) under the circumstances (e.g. in the autocratic, neutral or participative leadership styles, resp. in the objective appraisal, resp. at the open communication, resp. in the atmosphere of trust) is high, is equal to π . An alternative hypothesis H1 was set as follows: The probability that the motivation for analyzed motivating targets is high, is lower than the value of π .

For testing, we used the Test with parameter π of alternative distribution. An unknown probability π is estimated using the relative size of the phenomenon p (high motivation) – i.e. their number is divided by the number of choices. The test criterion has the shape $((p - \pi) \sqrt{n}) / \sqrt{\pi(1 - \pi)}$, where π is the estimated probability, p is the relative frequency of responders whose motivation to the given targeting is high (4–5, i.e. rather higher and high). The value of π in Table 4 is the lowest such that the level of significance α , at which the hypothesis H0 is not rejected, can be $\alpha < 0.05$. It is already rejected with the higher value, or we have to raise the level of α so that the probability π can be higher. Other values in the Table represent the relative frequency of respondents who said their motivation is high. If there the symbol π is replaced by the symbol **, then the test presumption $n > 9/p/(1 - p)$ is not achieved.

As we see e.g. in a case of participatory leadership, the value of all motivational targets is well above the average (minimum of 10%). For example, when searching the motivation for quality of work, the probability of factor $\pi = 87\%$ ($\pi = 0.87$ is expressed absolutely in Table) is relative to value for all types of leadership (together $\pi = 77\%$). This is at least of 20% higher against the neutral leadership. Although it should be noted the probability of effect even in the autocratic style is relatively high ($\pi = 57\%$), other factors probabilities are visibly reduced.

It flows comprehensively from the Table that the *significant impact of positive factors on the intensity of motivation* was confirmed in leadership, appraisal, communication, and

atmosphere. This means that the efficiency is the highest just in the positive forms of HPD processes: the participatory leadership, the objective and fair appraisal (level 4–5), the open communication (4–5), and the atmosphere of trust (4–5). And as can be seen in Table 4, the values are significantly higher than the average state.

We attach an extraordinary weight also to the respondents' willingness to *increase their level of work effort* if improved motivational approach from their superiors. If the approach of their superior will be improved, up to 2,138 (81.42%) of respondents (both employees and managers; 79.52% male and 82.75% female) express their willingness to increase their performance. The average improvement in their opinion would be of 44.64% (41.39% in male and 46.83% in female). 25.96% of them (21.91% of male and 28.69% of female) express their improvement of even more than 50%. 12.30% of respondents (10.37% of male and 13.60% of female) are willing to improve their results of even more than 75%. If we count even those employees (488, i.e. 18.58%) who think that they will not be improved (i.e. an improvement of 0%), then there would be an *overall performance improvement of 36.34%* (32.91% for male and 38.75% for female).

Tab 4. Relations of crucial HPD processes to motivation intensity

	To quality of work			To improving skills			To new suggestions			To cooper. + motivate														
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female												
	π	p	π	p	π	p	π	p	π	p	π	p												
Style of leadership vs. intensity of motivation																								
All (2,067)	.77	.79	.73	.76	.77	.80	.68	.71	.65	.69	.69	.72	.51	.53	.49	.52	.51	.54	.56	.58	.54	.57	.56	.59
Participative	.87	.89	.85	.88	.87	.90	.80	.82	.76	.80	.81	.84	.64	.67	.62	.67	.63	.67	.72	.75	.71	.75	.71	.75
Neutral	.68	.71	.64	.70	.68	.72	.58	.62	.57	.62	.57	.61	.41	.44	.38	.43	.40	.45	.46	.52	.42	.51	.45	.52
Autocratic	.57	.62	.49	.57	.59	.65	.48	.53	.42	.50	.49	.55	.25	.29	.20	.27	.26	.31	.31	.38	.19	.30	.34	.44
Objectivity of appraisal vs. intensity of motivation																								
All (2,626)	.80	.82	.78	.81	.80	.82	.72	.74	.70	.73	.72	.74	.56	.59	.57	.60	.55	.58	.61	.64	.61	.64	.61	.63
Almost yes (4–5)	.88	.89	.86	.89	.88	.90	.79	.81	.77	.80	.79	.82	.65	.67	.65	.68	.63	.66	.72	.74	.72	.75	.71	.73
Average (3)	.60	.64	.56	.62	.60	.65	.52	.56	.48	.55	.52	.57	.33	.37	.32	.38	.32	.36	.33	.37	.32	.38	.32	.37
Almost no (1–2)	.38	.45	.32	.42	.38	.46	.33	.40	.27	.36	.34	.42	.19	.25	.17	.26	.18	.25	.14	.19	**	.14	.16	.23
Openness of communication vs. intensity of motivation																								
All (2,626)	.80	.82	.78	.81	.80	.82	.72	.74	.70	.73	.72	.74	.56	.59	.57	.60	.55	.58	.61	.64	.61	.64	.61	.63
Almost yes (4–5)	.87	.89	.85	.88	.88	.90	.79	.81	.76	.79	.79	.82	.65	.67	.64	.67	.64	.67	.72	.74	.71	.74	.72	.75
Average (3)	.61	.65	.56	.62	.62	.68	.55	.59	.53	.59	.53	.59	.34	.38	.35	.41	.31	.36	.32	.36	.32	.38	.30	.35
Almost no (1–2)	.42	.48	.39	.50	.39	.47	.34	.40	.24	.33	.37	.45	.19	.24	.17	.25	.17	.24	.17	.22	.10	.17	.19	.25
Atmosphere of trust vs. intensity of motivation																								

All (2,626)	.80	.82	.78	.81	.80	.82	.72	.74	.70	.73	.72	.74	.56	.59	.57	.60	.55	.58	.61	.64	.61	.64	.61	.63
Almost yes (4–5)	.88	.90	.86	.89	.89	.91	.79	.81	.77	.80	.80	.83	.66	.68	.65	.69	.65	.68	.75	.77	.73	.76	.75	.77
Average (3)	.58	.62	.52	.58	.60	.65	.53	.57	.46	.52	.55	.60	.31	.35	.29	.35	.30	.34	.27	.31	.26	.32	.25	.30
Almost no (1–2)	.42	.48	.42	.51	.39	.46	.35	.41	.38	.48	.29	.37	.18	.23	.17	.25	.15	.21	.12	.17	.11	.18	.11	.16

This demonstrates that our survey has confirmed the dependence of the motivation intensity on the quality of key HPD processes. In addition, in connection with another question, where respondents were asked to identify the most necessary organizational measures that could help to increase their motivation, we can even confirm the *hypothetically constructed symbiotic spiral of the motivation and HPD processes*. In this question, respondents (76.10% of employees and 63.15% of managers) rank on the first position the increase of financial remuneration which means a direct link to the objectivity of appraisal. The second position includes the employee benefits (52.69% and 47.05%), i.e. correlation with the objectivity of appraisal and creation of a trust atmosphere. Third place belongs the expression of greater concern for employees and their opinions (46.64% and 44.19%), i.e. close relation to all four HPD processes: leadership, evaluation, communication, and creating trust/togetherness. Fourth place in the group of employees takes a correctness of superior (43.64%), i.e. relationship to the appraisal objectivity, leadership style, atmosphere of trust. Fourth place in the group of managers (40.25%) takes the mutual and open co-operation which means a relation to the openness of communication and the atmosphere of trust. Fifth in both groups is the expression of recognition for quality work (42.62% and 37.75%), i.e. a strong motivation dependency with all of studied HPD processes: leadership, appraisal, communication, and atmosphere).

3 Relations between key processes of human potential development

Besides exploring the symbiotic motivation-process spirals, and based on the opinions of many authors, we can also consider the next symbiotic links. These links hypothetically exist between and among the crucial processes of development of human potential. For example, when considering the *creative leadership* in relation to other HPD processes, an inspirational leadership builds the followers trust and leaders become a catalyst to carry organizational activities (Indrawati, 2014). This one plays as strategic tool to motivate the staff to enhance their potential growth and development (Fry, 2003) and significantly influences the creativity of work and motivation of other employees in team (Soviar, Varmus & Kubina, 2015). Mentioned ideas indicates mutual relations between leadership and other processes.

When relating for example the *performance appraisal* to HPD processes, different leadership styles may have positive or negative impact on organizational performance (Wang, Shich & Tang, 2010) and the appraisal system improvement needs to pay attention to the communication openness and participation style (Ibrahim et al., 2016, p. 529). But, for obtain all positive inter-processes impacts, “performance appraisal cannot degenerate into ‘a dishonest annual ritual’,” (Armstrong & Murlis, 1998). When relating the *building atmosphere and culture* to other processes, an applied style of leadership and way of manager’s behavior are elements with really strong influence on the organization culture (Čandík & Jedinák, 2016).

Apart from mentioned intra-organization procedural dependences, the importance of mutual relations among the processes of human potential development might be viewed also from the *external and long-term perspective*. We can consider an employer’s reputation based on an employer of choice concept (Armstrong, 2009). In this perspective, people want to work in the organization which their individual needs are met in – for a good job with prospects linked to training, appraisal and working with a good boss who listens and gives some autonomy but helps with coaching and guidance (Purcel et al., 2003). This means all the processes of human potential development are closely and mutually connected and related.

Stated opinions confirm that the creative leadership affects the resulting feeling which stems from the recognition of a work; communication supports a sense of appraisal objectivity; building trust predetermines the preferred and applied leadership style, and so on. Any crucial HPD process builds *its own symbiotic relationship* with any other HPD process. In this way, *symbiotic procedural spirals* arise. The binder of these spirals are just the motivation and all the motivational processes performed within the organization. The motivation accents and generates professionalism and willingness to lead creatively, appraise fairly, communicate effectively, and deepen the trust.

Conclusion

Theoretical and empirical analysis done in the paper indicates the existence of strong reciprocal and symbiotic spirals, pointed out even in the two areas surveyed. The first area was focused on acceleration interdependences between the motivating and each of the crucial processes of human development potential. The motivation acts herein as a central motivating force and as a core process to unite together and enhance each of other processes. The second area dealt with the existence of symbiotic spirals between and among the HPD processes. The

motivation herein stands like in the background (behind the scene) but this is only apparent. It is present in the escalation of course and the quality of each process. Higher and higher level and outputs of all of these spirals are a sign of a sustainable progress and total cultivation of the organization.

On that basis, we can also outline *another hypothetical construct*. In addition to all stated improvements, an accelerated level of motivation and crucial HPD processes may have an instigative and trigger impact on the *other business processes*. Production, marketing, finance, development, logistics, etc. rank among mentioned business processes. This presumption can be considered legitimate because every business process is projected and carried out only by the human beings. People are thinking, working with joy, full of enthusiasm, or vice versa, working with unwillingness, or even disgust. They embody their life and work motivation into the work and realize (or not realize) all their intellect and inflammation. Our survey results confirm that the employees want to be engaged in the control and decision-making in a higher degree. They are interested to learn and grow professionally and expect more of the open and mutual cooperation. This means the higher is the motivation of the individuals and groups for their professional work (marketing, production, finance, etc.), the more they try to improve the quality, parameters, deadlines, and continual improvement of these processes. In this way, the individuals and groups, through the precisely done processes of human potential development, dynamize or disrupt the continuity and level of any other professional business segments.

Correlatively, the achieved quality or dis-quality of the business processes, being influenced by the initial and subsequently by the continuously improved motivation, have affected a past motivation in previous. They will also act on the future motivation of the employees. An embedded expertise and experienced success or failure during the professional career (in business processes) are reflected in the success or failure of the results of each business process. These ones impact positively or negatively the motivation and satisfaction of the individuals and groups. Stated differently, the *hypothetical symbiotic motivation-process spirals* might be arisen also in the case of *motivation and/versus other business processes*.

Acknowledgment

Paper was conducted within the scientific projects: VEGA 1/0890/14 Stochastic Modelling of Decision Making Processes in Motivating Human Potential and KEGA 011ŽU-4/2014 Experimental Mathematics – How to See Invisible.

References

- Armstrong, M. (2009). *Handbook of Human Resource Practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Armstrong, M. & Murlis, H. (1998). *Reward Management*. 4th ed. London: Kogan Page.
- Campbell, D. E. (2006). *Incentive, Motivation and the Economics of Information*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Čandík, M. & Jedinák, P. (2016). Factors Influencing the Culture of Organization. *Human Potential Development*. Szczecin: University of Szczecin. 44–52.
- Faletar, J. & Jelačić, D. (2016). Changes in Motivating Employees in Croatian Wood Processing Company in Two Different Business Environments. *Human Potential Development*. Szczecin: University of Szczecin. 62–69.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Towards a Theory of Spiritual Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693–727.
- Hurley, R. F. (2011). *The Decision to Trust: How Leaders Create High-trust Organisations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Indrawati, N. K. (2014). Management by Inspiration: Implementation of Transformational Leadership on Business at Pondok Pesantren Sunan Drajat. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 115(2014), 79–90. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.417.
- Ibrahim, Z., Ismail, A., Mohamed, N. A. K. & Raudan, N. S. M. (2016). Association of Managers' Political Interests towards Employees' Feelings of Distributive Justice and Job Satisfaction in Performance Appraisal System. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 224(2016), 523–530. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.429.
- Igielski, M. (2015). Innovative Adapted Motivation Systems of Knowledge Workers to Needs Identified Appearing in Examined Enterprises from the Baltic Sea Region. *Human Resources Management and Ergonomics*, 9(2), 73–88.
- Ismail, A., Najib, A. M. & Arshad, M. M. (2012). Linking Political Behavior in Performance Appraisals to Distributive Justice as a Determinant of Job Satisfaction. *International Business Management*, 6(2), 103–112.

- Purcell, J., Kinnie, K., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B. & Swart, J. (2003). *People and Performance: How People Management Impacts on Organisational Performance*. London: CIPD.
- Shin, S. & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational Leadership, Conservation, and Creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal*, 703–714.
- Soviar, J., Varmus, M. & Kubina, M. (2015). Modern Approach to Teaching as University – Students Love the Real Problem. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 205, 401–406.
- Wang, F. J., Shich, C. J. & Tang, M. L. (2010). Effect of Leadership Style on Organisational Performance as Viewed from Human Resource Management Strategy. *African Journal of Business Management*, 114(18), 3924–3936.

Contact

Assoc. Prof. Martina Blašková, PhD.

University of Žilina

Univerzitná 8215/1; 010 26 Žilina; Slovak Republic

e-mail: blaskova@fri.uniza.sk

Dr. Rudolf Blaško, PhD.

University of Žilina

e-mail: beerb@frcatel.fri.uniza.sk

Ing. Kristína Tršková

University of Žilina

e-mail: kristina.trskova@gmail.com