



Leadership and Management Styles: Typological Approach to Personal Resources of Change Management

V. G. Gryazeva-Dobshinskaya and Y. A. Dmitrieva^(✉)

South Ural State University, Chelyabinsk, Russia
dmitrieva.julia.86@mail.ru

Abstract. Based on the analysis of the results of research into innovative leadership among managers, we address the problem of the relationship between leadership styles and managerial strategies of managers. We look at the relevance of using the typological approach in assessing the leaders' and managerial resources of the subjects. For our study, we used the MLQ questionnaire by B. Bass, B. Avolio and MSI questionnaire by I. Adizes on 254 managers working at several enterprises of the industrial holding company with various modernization conditions. We presented the results of the implementation of the typological approach to the differentiation of subjects by personal resources: the level of transformational or transactional leadership, the level of expression of strategies aimed at results or effectiveness. We conducted a comparative analysis of 7 typologies obtained, the accuracy of grouping subjects into which varies from 81.9 to 97.2%. We determined the optimal model of personal resources of change management by the ratio of 4 indicators: transformational and transactional leadership, strategies aimed at results and efficiency. This model implies a differentiation of managers into 16 subgroups. We identified the contributions of strategies and leadership styles of managers and determined the development prospects of human resources at each enterprise.

Keywords: Typological approach · Innovative leadership · Transformational leadership · Leadership styles · Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) · Management styles · Managerial strategies

1 Introduction

1.1 Literature Review

Increasing the personal effectiveness of managers when managing changes under uncertainty, pressure of time for actual reforms, risks while decision making poses an urgent problem for developing organizations. The social and cultural context of the solution of this matter is the development of managers as for the influx of ideas, maintaining creativity, non-standard, diversity. The optimal way to increase the personal effectiveness of activity in general and management activity, in particular, is the formation of an individual style of activity [27, 33]. The development of individual and

social creativity is based on the maintenance of individuality, tolerance to personal diversity when working in teams, as the source of creativity is a specific view of people on the world, problems, ways how to solve them [3, 6, 12–15, 17–19, 23, 32].

The purpose of this study is to identify the typological diversity of managers in the management of change, including managerial and creative variables. The study is based on the experimental results of fundamental psychology and is oriented toward the “psychological constructivism” of practical psychology [35].

The typological approach to management is actively used by researchers and practitioners. The popular classification of I. Myers-Briggs, P. Myers is based upon the concept of psychological types of K.G. Jung: the properties that characterize different styles, provide the originality of cognitive and emotional processing of information, which is the basis for making decisions by the subjects of management, ensures the effectiveness of certain types of management activities [26]. The Adizes’s classification starts from the uniqueness of the implementation of universal functions of the managerial activity - “production”, “entrepreneurship”, “administration”, “integration”, - managers of different styles are unequally effective in all management functions, so there is a need for a management team [1].

The typological approach to the theory and practice of creative activity is realized in several concepts. By developing the concept of psychological types of K.G. Jung, researchers specify the specifics of types in creative activity [4, 16]. The research within the dynamic activity paradigm reveals the fundamental parameters of activity - setting/supra-situational or conservation/change oriented activity, which determine the specifics of the types of subjects [5, 17, 20].

The implementation of the typological approach in the innovation activity of managers assumes the integration at the theoretical and practical level of a set of style indicators related to the variety of production development, business processes, human resources tasks solved by the manager; as well as style indicators of subjective choice of priorities of tactics and strategy of transformation and the preferred style of leadership.

The man’s style as a stable system of ways to implement different types of activity; an integral characteristic of individuality, shown in the subject’s preference for a certain form of interaction with the objective and social environment [25]. The integration of various styles in system typological classifications is given as the theory and practice. The research shows the interaction of style features of subjects (such as cognitive, intellectual, emotional, experience, creativity, communication styles) with individual-personal typological properties. This is typology of individual and personal properties as variants of “leading trends” which are integral formations of all individual styles in the fundamental substructures of the personality, as well as levels: from basic psychodynamic properties to attitudes and situational states [29]. These are studies of the relationship between cognitive styles and meta cognitive experience, including the intellectual control, cognitive position, as well as intentional experience, including preferences, beliefs, mindset.

The possibilities of a typological approach in the identification of hierarchical dynamic systems that include different style features of the interaction of subjects with the world, intentional tendencies and experience, and which are genetically related to

the occurrence situation, summarize the system description of the process of differentiation as the formation of new dynamic structures [2].

The empirical studies of “leadership” and “management” as change management styles in the company have been conducted autonomously, from different theoretical perspectives and with application of different methods of operationalization of the basic concepts [1, 9, 10, 21]. The most developed lines of leadership and management research, which have framed theoretical bases and vast empirical facts, are B. Bass’ Transformational Leadership Theory and I. Adizes Management Style Indicator. Bass’ Transformational Leadership Theory considers characteristics of leadership in the situation of company changes as various settings of influence on personnel. Adizes Management Style Indicator studies characteristics of management as management settings by the main management functions.

Bass’ multifactor leadership concept positions “transformational leadership” as most adequate to the situation of change management in the company [7, 8, 24]. Transformational leadership includes such leaders’ basic style behavioral features as broadening of interests of the subordinates, support of their personal growth and self-respect, their intellectual and creative stimulation and inspiration, incentive to go beyond the short-term individual interests, aspiration for changes complying with the team’s new significant objectives. Within the framework of this concept transformational leadership aimed at changing reality in accordance with the values is opposed to another style – which is transactional leadership aimed at an adaptive interaction with reality with varying degrees of success (from an efficient level to “catastrophic”). The concept is aimed at mastering the components of transformational leadership as a universal change management style to the maximum extent possible. This style is confirmed by many empirical studies [11, 22, 28, 34].

I. Adizes Management Style Indicator is aimed at differentiation of different management styles which, on the one hand, correspond best of all to managers’ personal features and, on the other hand, are most efficient in different conditions and cycles of the company development [1, 31, 36]. Universal management functions – “production,” “entrepreneurship,” “administration,” “integration” – are expressed differently in different managers. This excludes style universalism, but assumes a different approach for outlining individual management priorities or value orientations. These management functions are based on the four parameters which make these priorities identifiable. These are strategic management settings (“short-term prospects,” “long-term prospects,” “results,” and “effectiveness”). These parameters of management priorities and, accordingly, prevailing management functions of the managers with different styles are combined differently. Within the framework of this management style indicator, I.K. Adizes discusses development of leaders through understanding and evolution of the individual management styles with the relevant dominating management settings: “producer,” “administrator,” “entrepreneur,” “integrator.” The concept is aimed at optimization of interaction between the leaders with different styles within the management team [1].

1.2 Design

For studying of transformational leadership and strategic settings of managers we carried out the correlation and cluster analysis of the quantitative data of the psychological diagnostics. The analysis covered the entire sample group and subgroups of managers to outline interconnections of the leadership styles and the management styles, as well as interconnections between structural components of the styles. All the calculations were made by means of IBM SPSS Statistics statistical package.

1.3 Participants

254 managers from 3 enterprises of one industrial association took part in the research. These enterprises are located in different cities of one region and perform modernization with a various degree of successfulness.

1.4 Research Techniques

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) of B. Bass and B. Avolio was used for psychological diagnostics of the leadership structure [7, 8, 30]. This questionnaire contains three independent scales: “Transformational leadership”, “Transactional leadership” and “Self-assessment of the leadership effectiveness” interpreted subject to B. Bass’ multifactor leadership concept.

Transformational leadership (TFL) is described by the psychological content of the five scales of the technique: (a) leader’s influence giving rise to the experience of involvement in a case II(A); (b) leader’s influence inducing agreement of objectives and behavioral values II(B); (c) inspirational motivation IM; (d) intellectual and creative stimulation IS; (e) leaders’ individualized consideration of employees IC.

Transactional leadership (TSL) is described by the four scales: (a) contingent reward CR; (b) active management by exception (application of fines and sanctions) MBEA; (c) passive management by exception (situational management) MBEP; (d) laissez-faire LF.

Self-assessment of the leadership effectiveness (SEL) is described by the psychological content of the three scales: (a) mobilization of the team for an extra-effort EE; (b) collective efficacy EEF; (c) self-esteem and feeling of self-importance SAT.

The current version of the MLQ (form 5X, Copyright©1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio) was used. The Russian version of the MLQ was developed based on a translation-back-translation procedure. The original English was translated into Russian and then back-translated into English by a Russian translator. After that, the Russian translator checked the equivalence of the two English versions of the instrument. The items of the Russian instrument were formulated with the same contents as the items in the original instrument, taking into account the cultural features.

For psychological diagnostics of the management styles we used I.K. Adizes’ Management Styles Questionnaire (MSI) [1, 31, 36]. This questionnaire contains four independent scales characterizing different management styles: “producer” (P), “administrator” (A), “entrepreneur” (E) and “integrator” (I). These management styles are diagnosed by 4 components – strategic management settings.

Management style “producer” P is characterized by the settings for results “Res” and “short-term prospects” Stp. Management style “administrator” A is characterized by the settings for “effectiveness” Eff and “short-term prospects” Stp. Management style “entrepreneur” (E) is characterized by the settings for results “Res” and “long-term prospects” Ltp. Management style “integrator” (I) is characterized by the settings for “effectiveness” Eff and “long-term prospects” Ltp.

2 Results and Discussion

To identify the typological diversity when managing changes, including managerial and creative variables, options for differentiating managers were analyzed.

The final version of the typology is represented by sixteen types of managers, who are differentiated according to two style leadership parameters: transformational and transactional leadership, and to two management parameters: efficiency and resulting quality strategic attitudes. The results are shown in Table 1. You can see from the Table that each type is unequally represented in the sample to be examined: the “universal leader, resultative manager” and “effective manager” types are maximally represented, with “leader of “transactions”, “universal manager” and “absolute leader-manager” being minimally represented. This is consistent with studies of the Briggs Myers’ typology, with the one type representation is dispersed from 1% to 16%.

Table 1. The typology of managers in the management of changes.

No.	Type of manager-leader	TFL	TZL	Eff	Res	Quantity per group	
						Persons	%
Types of leaders							
1	Universal leader	max	max	min	min	15	4,2
2	Leader of “changes”	max	min	min	min	5	1,4
3	Leader of “transactions”	min	max	min	min	13	3,7
Types of managers							
4	Universal manager	min	min	max	max	6	1,7
5	Effective manager	min	min	max	min	33	9,3
6	Resultative manager	min	min	min	max	25	7,1
Types of managers-leaders							
7	Absolute leader-manager	max	max	max	max	4	1,1
8	Effective manager, universal leader	max	max	max	min	21	5,9
9	Resultative manager, universal leader	max	max	min	max	37	10,5
10	Universal manager, leader of “changes”	max	min	max	max	10	2,8
11	Effective manager, leader of “changes”	max	min	max	min	14	4,0
12	Resultative manager, leader of “changes”	max	min	min	max	26	7,3
13	Universal manager, leader of “transactions”	min	max	max	max	2	0,6
14	Effective manager, leader of “transactions”	min	max	max	min	22	6,2
15	Resultative manager, leader of “transactions”	min	max	min	max	9	2,5
16	Specialist	min	min	min	min	12	3,4

To identify the insights and to clarify the types identified, various options for differentiating managers by individual MLQ and MSI scales were analyzed.

The correctness of each differentiation was tested by means of discriminant analysis, which included the following stages: (1) the division of the general sample into groups according to the MLQ and MSI style parameters and the identification of different types of managers; (2) the assessment of the correctness of the attribution of managers to the selected groups (%); (3) the analysis of the main discriminant function and significant contributions of style parameters of leadership and management as the basis for type differentiation; (4) the analysis of the typology of managers obtained and clarification of groups. The results of stages 2 and 3 for each option of differentiation are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The results of the discriminative analysis for each option of manager differentiation.

Criterion of manager differentiation	The main discriminant function, according to which the classification of managers is described	The evaluation of the correctness of assigning managers to groups, %
TFL	$F = -12,015 + 0,217 * TFL + 0,036 - * Stp + 0,145 * SAT$	96,9
TZL	$F = -8,568 + 0,359 * TZL + 0,016 * I + 0,008 * E - 0,298 * Ltp - 0,069 * EEF - 0,065 * CR - 0,006 * A$	95,3
TFL и TZL	$F = -13,935 + 0,181 * TFL + 0,144 * TZL - 0,132 * SAT - 0,012 * SEL$	90,9
Eff	$F = -3,3 + 0,402 * Eff + 0,059 * IC + 0,017 * I - 0,142 * Ltp - 0,067 * MBEA - 0,048 * MBEP$	97,2
Res	$F = -4,453 + 0,581 * Res + 0,143 * Stp + 0,010 * E - 0,041 * MBEP - 0,018 * P$	96,9
Eff и Res	$F = -1,653 + 0,519 * Res + 0,285 * Ltp + 0,113 * MBEA + 0,070 * MBEP + 0,038 * Stp + 0,008 * A - 0,269 * Eff - 0,052 * TZL - 0,017 * I - 0,014 * P - 0,011 * E$	86,6
TFL, TZL, Eff и Res	$F = -9,583 + 0,738 * Res + 0,330 * Ltp + 0,309 * Stp + 0,053 * TFL + 0,040 * TZL + 0,0364 * Eff - 0,032 * P - 0,024 * I - 0,015 * E - 0,010 * A - 0,007 * SEL$	81,9

Legend: TFL – transformational leadership; IC – leaders’ individualized consideration of employees (TFL); TZL – transactional leadership; CR – contingent reward (TZL); MBEA – active management by exception (application of fines and sanctions) (TZL); MBEP – passive management by exception (situational management) (TZL); SEL – self-assessment of the leadership effectiveness; SAT – self-esteem and feeling of self-importance (SEL); EEF – collective efficacy (SEL); Stp – strategic management settings for “short-term prospects”; Ltp – strategic management settings for “long-term prospects”; Eff – strategic management settings for “effectiveness”; Res – strategic management settings for results; I – management style “integrator”; E – management style “entrepreneur”; A – management style “administrator”; P – management style “producer”.

2.1 The Manager Differentiation by MLQ

TFL level differentiation: one identifies the leaders of “changes”.

The sample is divided into two groups according to the level of transformational leadership: Group 1 of managers “TFL_{max}” (n1 = 132) with a TFL level higher than the average value (58 or more); Group 2 of managers “TFL_{min}” (n2 = 122) with a TFL level less than the average value (less than 57).

The differentiation obtained makes it possible to identify “leaders of changes” who are able to transform the real world. Besides the TFL style parameter which was taken as

the basis for the manager differentiation, the parameters of the self-esteem and a sense of self-worth and the short-term strategic attitude significantly contribute to develop the typology.

TZL level differentiation: one identifies the leaders of “transactions”.

The sample is divided into two groups according to the level of transactional leadership: Group 1 of managers “TZL_{max}” (n1 = 123) with a TZL level higher than the average value (32 or more); Group 2 of managers “TZL_{min}” (n2 = 131) with a TZL level less than the average value (less than 31).

The differentiation obtained makes it possible to identify leaders of “transactions” who are able to agree and to establish contacts. Besides the TZL style parameter which was taken as the basis for the manager differentiation, the parameters of collective efficiency, long-term strategic attitude as well as three styles of management (“integrator”, “entrepreneur” and “administrator”) significantly contribute to develop the typology.

TFL and TZL ratio differentiation – One identifies universal leaders.

The sample is divided into four groups according to the transformational and transactional leadership of ratio: Group of managers “TFL_{max}, TZL_{max}” (n1 = 77) with a high level of transformational and transactional leadership; Group of managers “TFL_{max}, TZL_{min}” (n2 = 55) with a high level of transformational leadership and a low level of transactional leadership; Group of managers “TFL_{min}, TZL_{max}” (n3 = 46) with a low level of transformational leadership and a high level of transactional leadership; Group of managers “TFL_{min}, TZL_{min}” (n4 = 76) with a low level of both transformational and transactional leadership.

The differentiation obtained makes it possible to identify, in addition to managers who are either “leaders of changes” or leaders of “transactions”, managers-universal leaders who combine functions of “leaders of changes” and leaders of “transactions”, as well as managers who do not have style leadership parameters and who are not leaders at all.

Besides the TFL and TZL style parameters which were taken as the basis for the manager differentiation, only the parameters of the MLQ Questionnaire (self-esteem and a sense of self-worth and self-feeling of leadership effectiveness) significantly contribute to develop the typology. The MSI parameters turned out to be insignificant when differentiating managers by the level of style leader parameters.

2.2 The Manager Differentiation by MSI

Eff level differentiation: one identifies the effective managers.

The sample is divided into two groups according to the level of the efficiency strategic attitude: Group of managers “Eff_{max}” (n1 = 112) with a high Eff level (9 or more); Group of managers “Eff_{min}” (n2 = 132) with a low Eff level (less than 8.5).

The differentiation resulted makes it possible to identify effective managers, with the efficiency and long-term strategic attitudes and the associated management style: the “integrator”, which can be realized through an individual approach to employees and the management that depends on deviations from norms and standards, being the significant contributor to the confirmation of the classification.

Res level differentiation: one identifies the resultative manager.

The sample is divided into two groups according to the level of the resulting quality strategic attitudes: Group of managers “Res_{max}” (n1 = 119) with a high Res level (7 or more); Group of managers “Res_{min}” (n2 = 135) with a low Res level (less than 6.5). The differentiation obtained allows us to identify resultative managers in the short term, who are able to be producers through the passive management to eliminate deviations from specified standards, by managing the situation.

Eff and Res ratio differentiation – One identifies universal managers.

The sample is divided into four groups according to the ratio of efficiency and resulting quality strategic attitudes: Group 1 of managers “Eff_{max}, Res_{max}” (n1 = 22) with a high level of efficiency and resulting quality attitudes; Group 2 of managers “Eff_{max}, Res_{min}” (n2 = 90) with a high level of efficiency and a low level of resulting quality attitudes; Group 3 of managers “Eff_{min}, Res_{max}” (n3 = 97) with a low level of efficiency and a high level of resulting quality attitudes; Group 4 of managers “Eff_{min}, Res_{min}” (n4 = 45) with a low level of efficiency and resulting quality attitudes.

The differentiation obtained allows us to identify universal managers who can be both effective and resultative at the same time, but with minimal creative and leader resources. Besides the efficiency and resulting quality strategic attitudes that were considered as the basis for the manager differentiation, the short-term and long-term strategic attitudes are the significant contributors to develop the typology.

2.3 Differentiation of Managers by MLQ and MSI Parameters – One Identifies the Types from Absolute Leaders-Managers to Specialists

The sample is divided into sixteen groups by the ratio of four parameters: transformational and transactional leadership, efficiency and resulting quality strategic attitudes. The description of each group and the quantity of people there are presented in Table 1. The typology obtained makes it possible to identify sixteen types of managers with different leader and management resources. The style management parameters, all the strategic management attitudes as well as transformational and transactional leadership styles contribute the most to this differentiation. Other variables of leadership, included in the scales of transformational and transactional leadership, are not significant contributors.

3 Conclusion

1. Based on the manager differentiation by groups according to the style MLQ and MSI parameters, the typological diversity of managers when managing changes was obtained. In total, sixteen types of managers were identified who differed in the ratio of style parameters of leadership and management. The maximum and minimum types of managers represented in this sample were identified. The “universal leader, resultative manager” and “effective manager” types are maximally represented, the “leader of “transactions”, universal manager” and “absolute leader-manager” are minimally represented.

The evaluation of the typology correctness. i.e. the manager differentiation by style parameters of leadership and management, was carried out using the discriminant analysis of the data of psychological diagnosis.

Based on the results of the discriminant analysis, the optimal model of leadership and management resources was obtained to differentiate managers by sixteen groups and to identify both absolute leaders-managers and just specialists.

2. The mathematical formula, approved on a large sample to identify the types of manager-leaders permits to identify the type of manager based only on the data of individual psychological diagnosis. The private typologies due to the revealed insights allow us to more accurately differentiate managers for various tasks of changes within the company, to carry out the professional selection.

Acknowledgments. The work was supported by Act 211 Government of the Russian Federation, contract № 02.A03.21.0011.

References

1. Adizes, I.K.: Stili menedzhmenta: ehffektivnye i neehffektivnye. Al'pina Biznes Buks, Moskva (2009)
2. Aleksandrov, I.O.: Formirovanie struktury individual'nogo znaniya. Izdatel'stvo Institut psikhologii RAN, Moskva (2006)
3. Amabajl, T.: Kak ubit' tvorcheskuyu initsiativu. Kreativnoe myshle-nie v biznese. Al'pina Biznes Buks, Moskva (2006)
4. Artemtseva, N.G., Grekova, T.N., Nagibina, N.L.: Psikhologiya iskusstva: tipologicheskij podkhod. RIO MGUDT, Moskva (2012)
5. Asmolov, A.G., Petrovskij, V.A.: O dinamicheskom podkhode k psikhologicheskomu analizu deyatel'nosti. Voprosy psikhologii **1**, 70–80 (1978)
6. Asmolov, A.G., Soldatova, G.U., SHajgerova, L.A.: O smyslakh ponyatiya «tolerantnost'». Vek tolerantnosti: nauchno-publitsisticheskij vestnik. Izda-tel'stvo MGU, Moskva, pp. 8–18 (2001)
7. Avolio, B.J.: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Third Edition Manual and Sampler Set. Published by Mind Garden. <https://www.mindgarden.com/Inc>
8. Avolio, B.J.: Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. J. Occup. Organ. Psychol., 441–462 (1999)
9. Bennis, W. Nanus B.: Leaders: The strategies for Taking Charge. Harper & Row, New York (1985)
10. Bennis, W.: Why Leaders Can't Lead. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco (1989)
11. Birasnav, M. Rangnekar, S. Dalpati, A.: Transformational leadership, interim leadership, and employee human capital benefits: an empirical study. Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci., 1037–1042 (2010)
12. Chiksentmikhaji, M.: Kreativnost'. Potok i psikhologiya otkrytij i izobretenij. Kar'era Press, Moskva (2013)
13. Csikszentmihalyi, M., Robinson, R.: Culture, Time, and Development of Talent. Conceptions of Giftedness, pp. 264–284. University Press, Cambridge (1986)

14. Fisher, G.: Razvitie sotsial'noj kreativnosti: pust' vse golosa budut uslyshany. *Psikhologiya. ZHurnal Vysshej shkoly ehkonomiki* **2**(4), 57–64 (2005)
15. Florida, R.: Kreativnyj klass: lyudi, kotorye menyayut budushhee. *Klassika-KHKH1*, Moskva (2005)
16. Goldstajn, D., Kreger, O.: *Tvorcheskaya lichnost': kak ispol'zovat' sil'nye storony svoego kharaktera dlya razvitiya kreativnosti*. Mann, Ivanov i Ferber, Moskva (2014)
17. Gryazeva-Dobshinskaya, V.G.: Innovatsionnoe liderstvo: modelirovanie tendentsij aktivnosti menedzherov predpriyatiya. *Vestnik YUUrGU. Seriya «Psikhologiya»* **9**, 9–17 (2010)
18. Gryazeva-Dobshinskaya, V.G.: Sinergiya vzaimodejstviya sub"ektov v sovместnoj tvorcheskoj deyatel'nosti kak mekhanizm tvorcheskogo liderstva. *Psikhologiya intellekta i tvorchestva: Traditsii i innovatsii*. Izdatel'stvo Institut psikhologii RAN, Moskva, pp 298–308 (2010)
19. Gryazeva-Dobshinskaya, V.G.: Tolerantnost' sub"ektov tvorcheskoj i innovatsionnoj deyatel'nosti kak sotsio-kul'turnyj kapital innovatsij predpriyatij. *Vestnik YUUrGU. Seriya «Psikhologiya»*, 15, pp. 17–24 (2011)
20. Gryazeva-Dobshinskaya, V.G., Dmitrieva, Y.U.A., Glukhova, V.A.: Resur-sy innovatsionnogo liderstva menedzherov: psikhologicheskij innovatsionnyj audit. *Izdatel'skij tsentr YUUrGU, CHelyabinsk* (2016)
21. Jin, S., Seo, M., Shapiro, D.L.: Do happy leaders lead better? affective and attitudinal antecedents of transformational leadership. *Leadersh. Quart.* **27**, 64–84 (2016)
22. Kanste, O., Miettunen, J., Kyngas, H.: Psychometric properties of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire among nurses. *J. Adv. Nurs.* **57**(2), 201–212 (2007)
23. Kornilova, T.V.: *Intellektual'no-lichnostnyj potentsial cheloveka v usloviyakh neopredelennosti i riska*. Nestor-Istoriya, Moskva (2016)
24. Kotter, J.P.: *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*. The Free Press, New York (1990)
25. Libin, A.V.: *Differentsial'naya psikhologiya: na peresechenii evropejskikh, rossijskikh i amerikanskikh traditsij*. Smysl, Moskva (1999)
26. Majers, I.: *Briggs MBTI: opredelenie tipov*. U kazhdogo svoj dar. Kar'era Press, Moskva (2014)
27. Merlin, V.S.: *Ocherk integral'nogo issledovaniya individual'nosti*. Pedagogika, Moskva (1986)
28. Mirkmali, S.M., Thani, F.N., Alami, F.: Examining the role of transformational leadership and job satisfaction in the organizational learning of an automotive manufacturing company. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.* **29**, 139–148 (2011)
29. Sobchik, L.N.: *Psikhologiya individual'nosti. Teoriya i praktika psikhodiagnostiki*. Idatel'stvo «Rech'». Sankt-Peterburg (2008)
30. Tejada, M.J.: The MLQ revisited Psychometric properties and recommendations. *Leadersh. Quart.* **12**, 31–52 (2001)
31. Tyutyunov, K.: *Proekty. Rabochaya tetrad'. Mini – MBA: prakticheskie znaniya dlya razvitiya biznesa*. Russkaya shkola upravleniya, Moskva (2008)
32. Ushakov, D.V.: *Sovremennye issledovaniya tvorchestva*. *Psikhologiya. ZHurnal Vysshej shkoly ehkonomiki* **2**(4), 53–56 (2005)
33. Vyatkin, B.A., Shukin, M.R.: *Novyj podkhod k issledovaniyu stilya v nauchnoj shkole V.S. Merlina. Psikhologiya integral'noj individual'nosti: Permskaya shkola*. Smysl, Moskva, pp. 219–232 (2011)

34. Yildirim, N., Birinci, S.: Impacts of organizational culture and leadership on business performance: a case study on acquisitions. In: 2nd International Conference on Leadership, Technology and Innovation Management, Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, pp. 71–82 (2013)
35. Zhuravlev, A.L., Ushakov, D.V.: Teoretiko-eksperimental'naya i prakticheskaya psikhologii. Paradigmy v psikhologii: nauchno-issledovatel'skiy analiz. Izdatel'stvo Institut psikhologii RAN, Moskva, pp. 158–177 (2012)
36. Zhurin, Yu.N.: Liderstvo. Rabochaya tetrad'. Mini – MBA: prakticheskie znaniya dlya razvitiya biznesa. Russkaya shkola upravleniya, Moskva (2008)