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ABSTRACT

The research aimed to study the relationship among leadership styles, organization commitment and emotional intelligence affected to salespeople’s job performance. The study examined the relationship through transformational and transactional leadership styles influenced job performance by mediating the effect of organization commitment and also explored the moderating role of emotional intelligence on the relationship between leadership styles and job performance. Results obtained from surveying a sample of 186 salespeople in Thailand showed that organization commitment was complete mediating the relationship between leadership styles and job performance. Similarly, the emotional intelligence of salespeople was moderating the relationship between leadership styles and job performance. Implications for research and practice of this finding will be discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Salespeople, who have acted as the organization impression and responsible for sales performance and business targeted in an organization. Salespeople have to be motivated to achieve high job performance. The successful of individual salespeople would affect to organization’s overall effectiveness (Baulldauf & Craven, 2002). Many researchers have devoted their efforts to studying salespeople, to try to understand and identified the factors which have influenced on job performance (Goolsby et al.1992; Plank & Reid, 1994). Previous research has found that the behavior of a sales manager’s could influence salespeople’s jobs and behaviors. Manager’s leadership or leader behavior had a powerful effect on the salespeople’s attitudes and behaviors (Bass, 1981).

Leadership has played an important role in human development and it has referred to the procedure of influencing major change throughout an organization and its membership in order to push an organization toward common goals and objectives (Slack, 1997). Much of the previous research had interested in study in transformational and transactional leadership styles. The study reviewed both leadership literature stresses the importance of “transformational leadership” (Bass, 1997) and “transactional leadership” (Burns, 1978 & Bass, 1985) effected to salespeople’s job performance. Transformational leadership pushed the organizations forward, created visions of potential opportunities for organizations, instilled within salespeople commitment to change, and developed new cultures and strategies (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). While transactional leader influenced to salespeople through the exchange of a good or a service that might serve as reward and promotions for good work or punishment undesired action for the work performed by the salespeople (Burns, 1978).
Shamir et al (1993) have found that transformational leaders were able to influence salespeople’s organization commitment by promoting higher levels of intrinsic value associated with goal accomplishment, emphasizing the linkages between salespeople’s effort and goal achievement, and creating a higher level of personal commitment on the part of the leader and salespeople to common vision, mission, and organization goals. Transformational leadership also encouraged salespeople to get more involved in work which motivated them to get higher levels of organization commitment (Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003).

As the purpose of study, to examined emotional intelligence of salespeople which has been a significant role in the work environment (Goleman, Boyatzis, & Mckee, 2002; Law, Wong, & Song, 2004; Sy & Cote, 2004; Wong & Law, 2002) that affected to job performance. Prior study has theorized that job performance influenced by salespeople’s ability to use emotional to facilitate performance (George & Brief, 1996). Salespeople with high emotional intelligence should be more adept at regulating their own emotions and managing other’s emotions which led to more positive interactions, and high job performance (Mossholder, Bedian, & Armenakis, 1981; Wong & Law, 2002).

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to investigate the relationship through leadership styles that influenced salespeople’s job performance by mediating effect of organization commitment and explored the moderating role of emotional intelligence (i.e. empathy, social skills); on the relationship between leadership styles and salespeople’s job performance. The research framework that guided this study was presented in Figure 1.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

Leadership Styles and Job Performance

Transformational leadership has been empirically determined to be positively associated with salespeople’s job performance, attitude, and perceptions (Bass and Avolio, 1993). Transformational leaders have assumed to “stimulate followers to perform beyond the level of expectations” (Bass, 1985, p.32). Burns (1978) was the first to explicitly define the definition of transformational leadership as identified transformational leadership as a process that would motivate salespeople by appealing to higher ideals and moral values. Transformational leaders have created a clear vision of the future and influenced others to share and implement the vision in spite of restraining and resisting conditions (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bass, 1985). Bass (1985) has stated that transformational leadership is correlated with perceived unit effectiveness and positively affects other organization outcomes. Bass (1985) has identified four components of transformational leadership as follows: (1) Idealized Influence characterized by the leaders who were admired, respected, and trusted. The leaders acted as a role model, shared risk with salespeople and behaved in a manner consistent to articulated ethics, principles and values. (2) Inspirational Motivation represented by the leaders who were providing meaning, challenging to their salespeople’s work and encouraging their salespeople to visualize attractive future states. (3) Intellectual Stimulation, presented to the leaders who stimulated salespeople to seek new ways to approach problems and challenges. (4) Individualized Consideration, represented by the leaders who paid attention to each individual’s need for achievement and growth by acting as a coach. These have supported that transformational leadership had a positive relate to salespeople’s performance.
Contrast with transformational leadership, transactional leadership have identified specific salespeople’s expectations and provided rewards in exchange for salespeople’s performance (Bass, 1985) and explicitly designed to clearly define and reward in-role performance (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p.109). Burns (1978) has presented a description of transactional leadership as a relationship between leaders and salespeople characterized by the exchange of commodities between the leaders and salespeople. The transactional leaders established goals, gave directions, and used rewards to motivate salespeople’s behaviors to achieve or go beyond established goals and punished undesired action. Bass (1985) has identified two factors as composing transactional leadership as (1) Contingent Reward (2) Management by Exception. According to Bass (1985), the rewards used by the transactional leaders included praise and recognition, merit increases, promotions, bonuses, or honors. These rewards can be given or withheld according to salespeople’s performance. The ultimate outcome of such contingent reward behavior would enhance and improved salespeople’s job performance.

Salespeople’s performance had based on an assessment of salespeople’s behavior and outcome that they have contributed to organizational objectives, accomplishment of the goals established by the organization and the acceptability of the salespeople’s interpersonal behaviors related to the norms of the organization. The varieties of activity and strategy that they have engaged in when executing their job responsibilities represent behavioral performance (i.e. making sales representation, team work’s corporation). Anderson and Oliver (1987) have identified sales support and planning as relevant dimensions of salespeople’s behavior performance. While their efforts and skills produced performance (i.e. sales, market share and new accounts).

A basic premise of “full range” leadership model (Avolio & Bass, 1991) which that transactional and transformational leadership are not viewed as opposite ends of the continuum. The same leader could display each of the full range of behaviors. Transformational leadership encouraged salespeople to put in an extra effort on job performance (Hater & Bass, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993). Prior research of Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir (2002) have found that transformational leadership had an indirect impact through a layer in the hierarchy on the performance of salespeople in an Israeli military field experiment and Howell and Avolio, (1993) have found relationships between transformational leadership styles and performance outcomes. Further, the study by Avolio, Waldman, and Einstein (1988) also suggested that the use of training programs to develop the skills of transformational and transactional leadership would enhance salespeople’s performance and organizational performance. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was proposed:

\[ H_1: \text{There are relationships between Leadership Styles and Job Performance}. \]

![Figure 1 Research Framework](image-url)
Organizational commitment (Greenberg & Spector, 1990) has been investigated on its antecedents, process and consequences. Studies have found many relationships of organizational commitment, behavior such as absence, turnover, job dissatisfaction, and pro-social behavior (Somers, 1993; Steers, 1997; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). Affective construct such as job satisfaction, job involvement, job performance, and higher motivation (Mowday et al., 1982). According to Meyer & Allen (1997), the committed salespeople have devoted more than expected times and effort on jobs and stayed with organization in all situations and protected organization’s asset, reputations. As Randell’s (1990) meta-analysis of organization commitment, noted that several researchers have theorized that organization commitment has related to positive work outcomes such as job performance, the results of Meyer et al. (1989) have support Randell (1990). Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**H2: There are relationships between Leadership Styles and Organization Commitment.**

The reasons of many researchers have been study on organizational commitment because its great impacted on salespeople’s attitudes and behaviors at work. Additionally, in the past decades, organizational commitment has widely investigated on its antecedents, process and consequences. Studies have found many relationships of organizational commitment: behavior such as absenteeism, job searching, turnover, turnover intention, and pro-social behavior (Somers, 1993; Steers, 1997; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986): attitudinal construct such as job satisfaction, job involvement, job performance, and higher motivation (Mowday et al., 1982). According to Meyer & Allen (1997), the committed salespeople have devoted more than expected times and effort on jobs and stayed with organization in all situations and protected organization’s asset, reputations. As Randell’s (1990) meta-analysis of organization commitment, noted that several researchers have theorized that organization commitment has related to positive work outcomes such as job performance, the results of Meyer et al. (1989) have support Randell (1990). Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**H3: There are relationships between Organization Commitment and Job Performance.**
This study proposed that Leadership Styles affected to job performance by mediating variables of organization commitment. As mention above, Transformational leadership have stimulated salespeople’s positive sense of self-worth and value led to enhance job performance, and organizational commitment. This was surprising since transformational leadership were expected to particularly impact salespeople’s behavior by “lift[ing] ordinary people to extraordinary heights” (Boal & Bryson, 1988, p.11) and causing salespeople to do “more than they are expected to do” (Yukl, 1989, p. 272). Organization commitment was reflected by a strong value in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, and salespeople put an effort on behalf of the organization and a strong desire to remain a member of the organization. Recently researches have suggested that transformational leadership has positive related to organizational commitment in a variety of organizational setting and cultures (Dumdum et al., 2002; Koh, Steers, & Terbog, 1995; Lowe et al., 1996; Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003). Organization Commitment was the committed individuals who willing to remain with their organizations, and willing to provide considerable effort on their behalf (Mowday et al., 1979).

Based on the argument above, assumed that transformational leadership would encourage salespeople with more opportunities for decision making, responsibility, and challenges as well as self-determination, these expected to result in higher levels of salespeople’s commitment (Wayne, Liden, & Sparrowe, 2000). In the other hands, transactional leadership provided a reward by admire and recognition, merit increases, promotions, bonuses, or honors (Bass, 1985), these as well expected to influence salespeople’s commitment. Prior study has claimed that certain form of commitment related to performance in predictable and meaningful ways (Becker, 1996). Accordingly, the hypothesis was proposed:

$H_k$: Organization Commitment mediates the relation between Leadership Styles and Job Performance.

Moderating role of emotional intelligence between leadership styles and job performance

Mayer and Salovey (1990) have defined emotional intelligence as “a type of emotional information processing that includes accurate appraisal of emotions in oneself and others, appropriate expression of emotions, and adaptive regulation of emotion, in such a way as to enhance living” (p.189). Goleman (1995) has claimed that emotional intelligence as “the abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one’s moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to emphasize and to hope” (p.34). Later on in 1998, Goleman has refined the definition of the emotional intelligence to “the capacity for organizing our own feelings and those for others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotion well in ourselves and in our relationship (Goleman, 1998; p.303). In working with emotion intelligence, Goleman (1995) has applied the emotional intelligence concept to the workplace setting. The emotional intelligence was skill in two key areas in his emotional competence framework; “personal competence” which represented how to manage ourselves (i.e. self regulation, self motivation) and “social competence” represented how to manage relationships (i.e. empathy, social skills). Emotional was a powerful psychological that could affect behavior and performance in important way (Brown et al., 1997). Emotional intelligence, also constructed social skill or social effectiveness, which fulfilled personality into observed performance (Douglas, Frink, & Ferris, 2004).

Earlier study has claimed that job performance influenced by salespeople’s ability to used emotions to facilitate performance (George & Brief, 1996). Salespeople’s emotional intelligence could predict their work outcomes (Wong & Law, 2002). Due to salespeople’s job characteristics, it was certainly that salespeople might encounter frustration conditions and their customers or leaders which could lead to
stressful emotions. Salespeople could use their both of positive and negative emotions to improve performance. Positive emotions as excitement or enthusiasm could stimulate salespeople provided better service quality to complete their work assignment. In the others hand, negative emotions as anxiety or nervous could stimulate salespeople’s capability to concentrate their jobs. Salespeople who had a high emotional intelligence should be more proficient at regulating their emotions and managing others’ emotions to encourage more positive interactions, which could lead to higher performance (Wong & Law, 2002; Mossholder, Bedian, & Armenakis, 1981).

Transformational leadership has appeared to provide positive emotions and comfortable with the emotion express to salespeople. (Dubinsky et al., 1995) and tended to be more optimistic and sensitive to how salespeople were feeling (Spreitzer and Quinn, 1996). Emotional intelligence has found positively correlate with job performance and leadership competence for top-managers in Taiwan small and medium size enterprises (Hsu, 2003). In addition, emotional intelligence also has found positively correlate with job performance for the salespeople of high-tech companies in Taiwan (Wu, 2003). Furthermore, Wu, (2004) also has found that there was relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance of salespeople in Taiwan. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**H5**: Emotional Intelligence will moderate the relation between Leadership Styles and Job Performance.

The earlier result of Deeter-Schmelz & Sojka (2003)’s in-depth interview have indicated that high-performing salespeople did demonstrate characteristics related to emotional intelligence and also concluded that emotional intelligence might play a significant role for salespeople to achieve high performance. Additionally, Emotional intelligence has found positively correlate with learning ability, and learning ability has found positively correlate with job performance for Taiwan engineering professionals in Chang’s study (2001). Moreover, Abraham (1999) has suggested that optimistic insurance salesman would perform better than pessimistic salesman, proposed that emotional intelligence is directly related to performance. This study was observed together with Goleman (1998) that emotional intelligence has related to job performance. Hence, the following hypothesis was proposed:

**H6**: Salespeople’s Emotional Intelligence will positive affect Job Performance.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

**Sample and Data Collection**

The objective of sampling plan was to survey salespeople in Thailand. The field salespeople’ represents in this study included those selling industrials, consumers and services products. The sampling frame comprised salespeople in Ladkrabang Industrial Estate Zone, Bangkok, Thailand those gathered organization’s name lists from Industrial Estate Authority of Thailand. Before the questionnaires were sent out, those were translated into Thai language by English - Thai professional. 60 companies were selected and made a phone call ask Sales Manager’s permission to survey their subordinates. 32 companies gave a corporation to send questionnaires direct to sales department for survey and collected questionnaires back in two weeks later. From 300 questionnaires, 203 sets were collected from the respondents. Seventeen responses were removed from the study because of incomplete response. Therefore, 186 respondents were used for the data analysis, yielding an effective rate of 62% .The majority 60.2% of respondents were female and 39.8% were male. The average age, 30.1% of respondents were 25-30 years and 22.6% were under 25 years. 64% of respondents were single. In education, 85.5% of respondents have bachelor degree. 37.1% of respondents have been working for 1-3
years and only 11.8% have been working for more than 12 years. 53.2% of respondents were selling for industrial product.

Measures

Leadership Styles

To test transformational and transactional leadership style, adapted an instrument from Multifactor Questionnaire Form 5R (MLQ Form 5R), a frequently used instrument developed by Bass & Avolio (1990) which included the five subscales of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward and management-by-exception. The MLQ Form 5R was self-scoring and used 18 items to measure the six subscales. These items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The Cronbach alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) for transformational leadership was 0.932 and transactional leadership was 0.814 respectively.

Organization Commitment

The organizational commitment examined salespeople by using the Organization Commitment Questionnaire which adapted from Allen and Meyer’s (1990). Three organization commitment types; affective, continuance and normative commitment are measured using a 5-point Likert scale. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was .861 for organization commitment.

Emotional Intelligence

The EQ test questionnaire adapted from Weisinger’EQ test instrument to measure the abilities’ of emotional intelligence. The questionnaires are measured using a 5-point Likert scale. This part required the respondents to rate abilities to apply emotional intelligence both of intrapersonal and interpersonal abilities. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was .785 in this study.

Job Performance

Job performance was modified from the multi-item scale developed by Behrman and Perreault (1982, 1984). The questionnaires are measured using a 5-point Likert scale. Job performance is defined as an evaluation of the salespeople’s behavior based on the contribution of the behavior to the organization’s objectives (Churchhill et al, 1985). It was useful to consider salespeople’s performance behavior and the outcomes. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for behavioral performance and outcome performance were .868 and .871 respectively.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics, correlation matrix, mean and standard deviations between variables in this study were presented in Table 1. Correlation in Table 1 indicated that transformational leadership correlated positive to job behavior performance \( (r = 0.309, p < 0.001) \) and positive related to job performance \( (r = 0.198, p < 0.001) \). Transactional leadership also significantly correlated to job behavior performance \( (r = 0.297, p < 0.001) \). Then, Leadership styles significantly correlated with job performance \( (r = 0.173, p < 0.05) \). Hypothesis 1 was support.
Table 1: Correlation among Leadership Style, EQ, Organization Commitment & Job Performance (n=186)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transaction</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Regulation</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.0</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self Motivation</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.578*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Skills</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.425*</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emotional Continuance</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.780*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. OC Affective Continuance</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OC Normative Continuance</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.574**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. OC Commitment</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Job behavior</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.381*</td>
<td>.552**</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Job outcome</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.577**</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Mean Mean</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Correlation in table 1 showed that leadership styles correlated positively with organization commitment \((r = 0.327, p < 0.001)\) provided initial support for Hypothesis 2. Furthermore, transactional leadership positively correlated with affective commitment \((r = 0.448, p < 0.001)\), also positively correlated with continuance commitment \((r = 0.259, p < 0.001)\), as well significantly correlated with organization commitment \((r = 0.306, p < 0.001)\). At the same time transformational leadership positively correlated with affective commitment \((r = 0.242, p < 0.001)\), also positively correlated with continuance commitment \((r = 0.252, p < 0.001)\) and significantly correlated with organization commitment \((r = 0.269, p < 0.001)\).

To test Hypothesis 3 by assumed that Organization commitment positively correlated with job performance. The results in table 1 showed that affective commitment correlated positive to job behavior performance \((r = 0.346, p < 0.001)\), also positive related to job outcome performance \((r = 0.319, p < 0.001)\) and significantly correlated with job performance \((r = 0.388, p < 0.001)\). Continuance commitment correlated positive to job behavior performance \((r = 0.175, p < 0.05)\), also positive related to job outcome performance \((r = 0.479, p < 0.001)\) and significantly correlated with job performance \((r = 0.402, p < 0.001)\). Normative commitment significantly correlated with job outcome performance \((r = 0.340, p < 0.001)\) and correlated positive to job behavior performance \((r = 0.308, p < 0.001)\), and also positive related to job performance \((r = 0.382, p < 0.001)\).

Organization commitment positively correlated with job performance \((r = 0.505, p < 0.001)\) also positive related to job behavior performance \((r = 0.354, p < 0.001)\) and correlated positive to job outcome performance \((r = 0.493, p < 0.001)\), So Hypothesis 3 was significantly support.

To tested mediation effect of organization commitment, followed by the procedure outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986), specifically multi-level mediation testing procedures recommended by Krull and Mackinnon (1999, 2001) for mediation testing. According to Baron and Kenny (1986) and Krull and MacKinnon (1999, 2001), four terms analysis needed to be met to support full mediation.

First, the independent variable (i.e. leadership style) needed to be significantly related to a mediator (i.e. organization commitment). Second, leadership styles needed to be significantly related to job performance. Third, organization commitment needed to be significantly related to job performance. Finally, the relationship between leadership styles and job performance must disappear when organization commitment is introduced into the regression equation predicting job performance then will be a complete mediation. If the coefficient between leadership styles and job performance after introducing organization commitment into the regression equation remained significant but is reduced, there was evidence for partial mediation.

| Table 2: Results of Regression Analysis for Mediation |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | Step 1          | Step 2          | Step 3          |
| **Leadership Style** | 0.173 (0.018*)   | -----           | 0.006 (0.931)   |
| **Organization Commitment** | -----       | 0.505 (0.000***)| 0.503 (0.000***)|
| \(\Delta R^2\)     | 0.025           | 0.251           | 0.247           |
| \(F\)              | 5.673           | 62.574          | 31.211          |
| \(df\)             | (1.183)         | (1.183)         | (2.182)         |

*\(p < 0.05\), **\(p < 0.01\)
The results of regression analysis for mediation were shown in Table 2, by tested the relationship between independent variable (leadership style) and dependent variable (job performance) which leadership style was positive relation with job performance ($\beta = 0.173, p = 0.018$).

The results in Table 3 presented independent variable (leadership style) and mediating variable (organization commitment), the results showed that there were correlated positive relation between them ($\beta = 0.327, p = 0.000$).

**Table 3: Results of Regression Analysis for leadership style and organization commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(\beta)</strong></td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>22.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>(1.184)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p <0.01

The results in Tables 2 also showed the control variables of mediating variable (organization commitment) and the dependent variable (job performance) was significantly support ( \(\beta = 0.505, p = 0.000\)). Since they all significant and after controlling for organization commitment, Leadership’s magnitude became not significant (as in Table 2, \(\beta = 0.006, p = 0.931\)).

These result according to Baron and Kenny (1986), supported organization commitment as a complete mediator of relationship between leadership style and job performance, thus Hypothesis 4 was support.

The results of the moderated regression analysis were shown in Table 4. The relation between leadership styles and emotional intelligence on job performance correlated negative relation ( \(\beta = -1.919, p = 0.010\)). So can concluded that leadership styles and job performance relationship is moderated by emotional intelligence. Thus, Hypothesis 5 was support.

**Table 4: Results of Regression Analysis for Moderator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Styles</td>
<td>0.173 (0.018*)</td>
<td>0.141 (0.024**)</td>
<td>1.697 (0.005**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.559 (0.000***)</td>
<td>1.631 (0.000***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Styles (X)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-1.919 (0.010***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.673</td>
<td>44.448</td>
<td>32.897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p <0.01
To tested Hypothesis 6, the results in Table 2 showed that self regulation positive correlated with job performance ($r = 0.440, p < 0.001$). Self motivation also significantly correlated to job performance ($r = 0.577, p < 0.001$). Additionally, self empathy positive correlated with job performance ($r = 0.455, p < 0.001$) and social skills positive correlated with job performance ($r = 0.268, p < 0.001$). Furthermore, emotional intelligence significant correlated with job performance ($r = 0.563, p < 0.001$). Thus, concluded that Hypothesis 6 was supported.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between leadership styles and job performance by focusing on organization commitment and emotional intelligence on salespeople. The results of this study supported the hypothesized relationships among these variables. This finding was present three main conclusions. First, the result found the relations between transformational and transaction leadership correlated positive with job performance; since transformational leadership did not replace transaction leadership but built upon the base of effective transaction leadership to obtain higher performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993). The result consistent with the previous studies showed that there were positive significant relationships between transformational leadership and job performance (Hater & Bass, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993). It was possible that salespeople were more likely their leaders recognized what they need and desire and clarified how these needs and desires will be met, supported them to put an extra effort (Bass & Avolio, 1993), as well as provided rewards or exchanges to motivate them achieve the goals (Howell & Avolio, 1993).

Second, this study also explored the relationship between leadership styles and job performance by mediated organization commitment. The finding supported that organization commitment as a complete mediator of relationship between leadership styles and job performance, transformational leadership encouraged salespeople with more opportunities for decision making, responsibility, and challenges as well as self-determination, these expected to result in higher levels of salespeople’s commitment (Wayne, Liden, & Sparrowe, 2000), while transactional leadership provided a reward by admire and recognition, merit increases, promotions, bonuses, or honors (Bass, 1985). This study results confirmed with the prior research that organization commitment had a positive relationship to job performance (Meyer et al., 1989 & Randell 1990).

Third, the study found that emotional intelligence moderated the relationships between leadership styles and job performance. More specifically, self motivation had a strong positive effect to job performance as emotional tendencies that guided or facilitated to reaching the goals (Goleman, 1998). The result supported with the previous studies that emotional intelligence was found positively correlate with job performance (Hsu, 2003 & Wu, 2003). However, the relation between leadership styles and job performance that moderated by emotional intelligence was significant negative correlate, can assumed that salespeople need to be more recognize and concentrate by leader as used transformational leadership styles, not only exchanged reward to attain the goals as transactional leadership styles (Bass, 1985).
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