THE ASIAN BULLETIN OF BIG DATA MANAGMENT
Vol. 5. Issue 1 (2025)
https://doi.org/10.62019/abbdm.v5i1.314

Antecedents of Organizational Performance: From Pakistani perspective

Khizar Hayat*, Atif Aziz, Athar Iqbal, Syed Muhammad Salman, Uzma Atif Jafri

Chronicle

Article history
Received: 20 Jan, 2025
Received in the revised format: 26th Feb, 2025
Accepted: 17th March, 2025
Available online: 20 March, 2025

Khizar Hayat, Atif Aziz, Athar Iqbal, Syed Muhammad Salman and Uzma Atif Jafri are currently affiliated with Iqra University, Karachi, Pakistan.

Email: khizar.hayat@iqra.edu.pk
Email: atif.aziz@iqra.edu.pk
Email: athar@iqra.edu.pk
Email: smsalman@iqra.edu.pk
Email: uzma.atif@iqra.edu.pk

Corresponding Author*

Abstract

Managers in today's business world have an obligation to serve the organization and customers by inspiring employees to obey orders. To be successful under the challenging business climate, managers must implement effective leadership practices. In this research, three modern leadership styles - green leadership, servant leadership, and digital leadership - are explored and their influence on organizational performance is tested with leader distance as a moderator. Relying on the literature, a conceptual framework was formulated employing theories of AMO and RBV. Workers of the textile sector were included in the study and data analysis was done employing SPSS software. Findings indicated that there exists a positive effect of servant leadership and digital leadership on organizational performance and no such correlation was observed in the case of green leadership. Furthermore, leader distance is in a negative correlation with green and servant leadership styles' effectiveness. The article concludes by outlining implications, constraints, and research proposal suggestions in the future.

Keywords: Servant leadership, green leadership, digital leadership, Leadership distance, organizational performance.

INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed an increasing concern of researchers and managers towards leadership practices (Choudhary, Akhtar & Zaheer, 2012). The financial crisis led to a movement from conventional models of leadership towards creative approaches for the solution of new corporate challenges. Putra et al. (2020) suggested that conventional leadership practices are no longer sufficient in terms of solving business goals, so the need emerged to adopt modern leadership styles. In addition, Purwanto, Asbari, and Budi (2019) indicated that leadership is an interactive process between the employees and leaders where the leaders motivate and direct the workers to channel their efforts toward organizational objectives. They indicated the leadership's central position in bridging individual contribution to overall organizational achievement. Further, they indicated that technological change has generated new styles of leadership customized for the requirements of a changing business world. Sihombing et al. (2018) emphasized digital leadership in spearheading innovation and inspiring employees, considering it a necessity to survive in an organization and avoid the shadow of failure. Choudhary, Akhtar & Zaheer (2012) emphasized that the leader-follower relationship is a major subject in corporate

discussions, with an emphasis on its relevance in achieving maximum productivity among employees and improving organizational performance. Ethics- and morality-based leadership models ought to come above traditional forms of leadership. According to Schneider and George (2011), most researchers have scrutinized ethical leadership and contrasted it with spiritual, authentic, and transformational leadership. Schneider and George clarified that servant leadership is more beneficial as it is based on the behavioral and emotional dimensions, which ultimately lead to organizational performance. McCann, Graves, and Cox (2014) stressed that servant leadership will be a driving force to enable organizations to address the complexity of current challenges. Likewise, Peterson et al. (2012) pointed out that increasing pressure on corporate social responsibility has put servant leadership as an important driver of organizational success. Chen and Chang (2013), through their research, found that stakeholder pressure and other leadership practices have urged organizations to adopt green leadership in order to enhance environmental performance and address the issues of sustainability. In order to gain a shared objective and achieve social welfare via business success, organizations are asked to develop a green culture among employees.

Therefore, studies on the impact of such changing leadership practices on organizational performance have become highly relevant. As the world is shifting towards the era of competition, organizational leaders are left with the dilemma of balancing organizational needs and customer demands through motivating their organizations to implement appropriate leadership practices (McCann, Graves & Cox, 2014). Notwithstanding the large body of literature that has examined the influence of different leadership styles on organizational, work, and environmental performance, relatively little research has been conducted on the conjoint influence of green, servant, and digital leadership on organizational performance. Dijkstra (2018) documented a broad knowledge gap in the case of digital leadership, where organizations do not know its potential implications for performance. This research bridges this gap by looking at how all these styles of leadership cumulatively affect organizational performance and in the context of Pakistan's textile industry. The textile industry, as an important sector of Pakistan's economy, was selected due to its core importance.

According to the Ministry of Textiles (2020), the sector accounts for 60% of national exports of the country and is the economic backbone of the country. Although essential, the industry is plagued by structural issues such as diminishing export volumes. Total textile exports stood at $9.6 billion and represented around 85% of the GDP, as indicated by the 2020 Economic Survey of Pakistan. Khan and Khan (2010) noted that past research is mainly focused on the monetary and manufacturing aspects of the textile sector with less regard for human capital and how it can contribute to sectoral performance improvement. This lacuna has compelled the present study to examine the role of leadership styles and organizational performance in the textile industry. Precisely, the study delves into the role of green, servant, and digital leadership in the textile industry in Pakistan, with the general aim to present significant information on leadership practices. The study also examines the moderating influence of leader distance in affecting the relationship between the aforementioned leadership styles and organizational performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to design the framework of the study, Resource-Based View (RBV) theory is blended with the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) theory to provide a fundamental base. The theoretical frameworks are applied to analyze the effectiveness of green, servant, and digital leadership styles in Pakistan's textile sector. The RBV focuses on the fact that a company's competitive advantage and performance are founded on its strategic resources, which need to be valuable, rare, and inimitable (Barney, 1991). Use of such resources allows organizations to attain superior performance in the long run and maintain a competitive advantage (Amit & Schoemaker, 1993).

Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) Theory

This theory is complemented by the RBV strategy as it focuses on employees' competences, motivation, and opportunities in generating superior organisational performance. An amalgamation of RBV and AMO enables extensive consideration of the influence of leadership on firm performance through efficient management of resources and human capital growth. The implications of these theories highlight the focal position of leadership in attaining long-term competitive advantages through consolidation of sustainable competitive advantages and emphasize the importance of considering the influence of leadership in industries with structural issues such as Pakistan's textile industry.

The Role of Leadership and Employee Engagement in Organizational Performance

Workers and management have a core function of instilling motivation for development, as well as fostering opportunities that promote good job behavior, thus improving organizational performance in a positive manner (Boxall & Steenveld, 1999). Green, servant, and digital leadership styles are closely associated with the concepts of the Resource-Based View (RBV) theory. These types of leadership styles enable employees to be incorporated within the company's intricate social systems in order for them to attain organization-specific characteristics that benefit the firm (Takeuchi et al., 2007). This perspective also gets support from the AMO (Ability-Motivation-Opportunity) theory by highlighting the role of employees' ability, motivation, and opportunities in enhancing organizational performance. The argument highlights the role of leaders and strategic HR practices in shaping performance (Appelbaum et al., 2000). It is argued by Gerhart (2005) that well-motivated and responsible leaders to their environment can positively influence their employees and thus enhance organizational performance as a whole.

Green Leadership

For one to compete against the contemporary business world, firms must prioritize the environmental agenda first (Porter & Van der Linde, 1995). Green leaders differentiate themselves from other entrepreneurs for adopting environmentally sustainable paradigms that direct conducting business affairs that grant them a specific competitive advantage (Boiral, Cayer, & Baron, 2009). Powerful green leaders require positive thinking, and they shall lead organizations in embracing sustainable forms of

conducting activities in the context of the environment (Crossman & Crossman, 2011). In this study, three core domains of green leadership are discussed:

- **Openness to Change:** Green leaders need to show willingness to introduce radical changes in current organizational routines or environmentally unsustainable strategies (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Egri & Herman, 2000).
- **Self-Enhancement:** To accomplish the company's environmental objectives, they need to embrace self-transcendence values (Kag, 1996).
- **Ethical and Eco Motives:** Green leaders are responsible for making ethical choices that foster environmentally sustainable business practices (Wood, 1991; Mayer et al., 2012).

Asbari (2020) argues that leadership behavior is central to determining how a company responds to environmental issues as different leadership behaviors project different degrees of concern for sustainability. Slamet et al. (2020) hold the perception that transformational leaders with values of green do have an important impact on the environmentally friendly behavior of their followers by encouraging them to address environmental issues and develop creative solutions to environmental challenges. The significance of green leadership in the formation of an ecologically sustainable culture is clear. Walhi (2014) emphasized that organizations were the main contributors to environmental degradation, and the level of pollution had hit 82.5% in 2013. This underscores the imperative need for green leadership to tackle environmental issues and ensure sustainable practices within organizations. As organizations expand, their environmental impact and pollution rates can rise unless steps are taken. Therefore, effective leadership is crucial to lead corporations to social responsibility, environmental sustainability, and economic competitiveness.

Servant Leadership

Asbari (2020) argues that leadership behavior is central to determining how a company responds to environmental issues as different leadership behaviors project different degrees of concern for sustainability. Slamet et al. (2020) hold the perception that transformational leaders with values of green do have an important impact on the environmentally friendly behavior of their followers by encouraging them to address environmental issues and develop creative solutions to environmental challenges. The significance of green leadership in the formation of an ecologically sustainable culture is clear. Walhi (2014) emphasized that organizations were the main contributors to environmental degradation, and the level of pollution had hit 82.5% in 2013. This underscores the imperative need for green leadership to tackle environmental issues and ensure sustainable practices within organizations. As organizations expand, their environmental impact and pollution rates can rise unless steps are taken. Therefore, effective leadership is crucial to lead corporations to social responsibility, environmental sustainability, and economic competitiveness.

Digital Leadership

Akkaya and Tabak (2020) explained that being in a time of rapid digital transformations has revolutionized the definition of leadership. Abbatiello, Knight, Philpot, and Roy (2017) noted that digital leaders are the future, elaborating that such leaders should guide innovations and promote healthy collaboration to enable cross-

functional as well as vertically integrated teams to work together. These leaders are also responsible for spearheading informal groups, networking, facilitating the sharing of knowledge, and developing inclusive and diverse environments. Additionally, digital leaders are required to marry proven leadership strategies with current technology. According to Sipior (2020), effective crisis management entails solid planning, preparation, and leadership. Those firms that treat IT resources as strategic assets will probably match their IT strategy to their business strategy, to use the IT resources in the most efficient manner. Senior executives, such as Chief Information Officers, recognize that alignment of IT strategy with business strategy is still an important topic in IT management (Sabherwal et al., 2019). Asbari et al. (2020) contend that leadership goes beyond the position or job titles, as it involves having the ability to bring people together, resources, and tools towards facing challenges and advancing towards goals.

Organizational Performance

The fundamental goal of any organization is to attain and maintain a sustainable long-term competitive edge. Organizational performance is measured using a range of factors, most of which are tangible such as "cost reduction, asset turnover, equity turnover, sales volume, and inventory turnover." Intangible indicators are less frequently used (Rhodes et al., 2008). Organizational performance is used as the yardstick of an organization's advancement, indicating its efficiency in achieving its objectives (Hamon, 2003). Researchers have different viewpoints concerning organizational performance. Javier (2002) linked performance with the renowned "3 Es"—economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in operations and activities. Daft (2000) also defined organizational performance as the capacity of a company to achieve its goals by effectively utilizing resources. Ricardo (2001) differentiated between productivity and performance, clarifying that productivity quantifies the amount of work done within a given period, whereas performance involves a wider range, including productivity, quality, consistency, and other essential factors.

In performance-based evaluations, productivity measures are usually given more emphasis. Hansen and Wernerfelt (1989) noted two main schools of thought in the literature regarding determinants of organizational performance (OP) in business policy. They have one based on economic theory with an emphasis on external market situations and another rooted in behavioral and sociological frameworks with an emphasis on internal organizational forces and matching them with the environment to bring success. Five organizational performance influencers were identified by Chien (2004), namely leadership style and environment, organizational culture, job design, motivational frameworks, and human resource policies. Several researchers such as Hansen and Wernerfelt (1989) have justified the economic and organizational models. These researchers established through their research that economic explanations covered only 18.5% of business returns variation, but organizational factors had an explanation power of 38%, highlighting that internal organizational factors have a significant influence on performance. Trovik and McGivern (1997) is also supported with this observation. Therefore, in examining the leadership behavior dynamics, employee performance, and organizational effectiveness within this challenging environment, one must consider quantifying the leader distance impact on these dynamics.

MODERATING VARIABLE:

Leader Distance

In the present globalized age, when there is massive technological progress, remote and virtual work has come into the limelight on a mass scale, especially in the COVID-19 pandemic. Virtual teams are also referred to as teams of members belonging to different functions, organizations, and geographical locations. With the nature of work teams still evolving, it also affects the relationship between team members and leaders.

Changing Nature of Work Teams

Organizational and geographical boundaries are more and more giving way to flexibility, such that individuals may work from wherever they want, benefiting both individuals and organizations alike. Organizations today can tap a global talent base, hiring specialists globally—a distinction unimaginable previously. Furthermore, having team members across different time zones enables an ongoing momentum clock-wise, compacting the schedule of projects as well as hastening response rates to customers. This variety in such teams, on the basis of multiple viewpoints, can contribute to a significant role for organizational innovation, creativity, and performance (Distefano & Maznevski, 2000; Sweeney et al., 1998; Stahl, Maznevski, Voigt & Jonsen, 2000). The staff members also have telecommuting arrangements where they get to choose their own work times. As per a survey by IWG (2019), 70% of the global workforce teleworks at least one day a week (Gibson & Cohen, 2003).

Though these have been benefits of virtual teams and telework, they encounter insurmountable challenges, namely in communication and coordination. Because of time zones or overlapping calendars, some of the team members are likely to work outside of their regular hours, possibly impacting their work-life balance. Asynchronous working may also be associated with retarded feedback and disruption of communication flow (McGrath, 1991). These problems could imply disruption of communication, misunderstanding, and coordination problems, sometimes leading to conflicts (Hinds & Bailey, 2003). Besides, language differences, absence of body language signals, and differences in background or culture could further complicate the communication. Virtual teams often have no chance to build personal relationships, thus resulting in poor levels of trust (Crisp & Jarvenpaa, 2013).

Leading at a Distance

Virtual teams usually face typical challenges, and the role of the manager in such a situation is crucial. Leadership behavior, as found by a research study, plays a key role in resolving problems in virtual teams by establishing mutual trust between the manager and employee (Peñarroja, Orengo, Zormoza, & Hernández, 2013). Physical distance in virtual teams diminishes people's contacts, which makes it impossible for a leader to lead, assist, provide feedback, and coordinate. Hence, distance can erode leadership performance (Howell et al., 1990). To bridge these gaps, leaders must develop new skills and communicate effectively across cultural, functional, and geographical boundaries (Bednarek, Schneider, Svatos, Oldham, & Hahlbrock, 2005). Although virtual teams are more prevalent than ever before, there is still limited

research on how leader distance affects the relationship between leadership style and organizational performance (Gilson et al., 2015).

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Green Leadership and Firm Performance

Noorliza (2020) also emphasized that green leadership enhances environmental capabilities considerably, thus improving ecological performance. Managers and leaders adopting green values, such as in Kitsis and Chen (2021), can facilitate organizational green programs more effectively and, ultimately, attain sustainability in environmental performance (Slamet et al., 2020). Equally, Crossman and Crossman (2011) required green leaders, through proactive sensitization promotion on green matters, to instill a sense of responsibility among employees, leading to improved sustainable performance. Experimental evidence has proven that sustainable environmental performance by companies can be achieved if the leader embraces green leadership practices since, in exchange, employees will give due attention to activities for environmental goals within their company (Asbari et al., 2020).

H1. Green leadership has a positive impact on sustainable performance.

Servant Leadership and Firm Performance

Koesmono (2014) defined that servant leadership exerts significant influence on work and organizational performance. Likewise, Muller et al. (2018) emphasized that servant leaders' behavior plays a primary role in the development of organizational performance. Albloshi (2015) stated that servant leadership is more appropriate to the organization's millennial generation, as the available evidence demonstrates statistical correspondence between leadership style and organizational performance. Reinke (2004) has noted that organizational performance is positively related to employee performance, thus implying that employee performance improvement eventually translates into firm performance. Hale and Fields (2007, however, tested the interlinkage between servant leadership and organizational performance using the cultural framework of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) project. Their cross-societal research in Ghana and the USA concluded that humility and service were independent of leadership effectiveness in each society, whereas vision was a significant driver of leadership effectiveness in Ghana. This discrepancy was explained by attributing the larger power distance among Ghanaian leaders compared to USA leaders. In addition, De Waal and Sivro (2012) determined that servant leadership and firm performance have some correlation which appears especially in how it supports employees' loyalty. Generally speaking, according to literature, servant leadership has direct and indirect effects on organizational performance.

H2. Servant leadership is positively related to organizational performance.

Digital Leadership and Firm Performance

Digital leadership is a term very much associated with digitization and usually attributed to leaders with a personal history of digital technologies. Digital leadership is present at organizational levels ranging from CEO, CIO, or project/team leaders.

One of the basic questions in this area is how these digital leaders who head digital projects can be leveraged to improve organizational performance. This is based on the assumption of the upper echelons theory that digitally knowledgeable leaders are most likely to make decisions based on their experience and knowledge in the digital field. The IT or digitally knowledgeable leaders, as assumed by this theory, are most likely to possess a digital vision, and this will shape their decision-making. Such choices, consequently, contribute to higher-quality information systems (Ding et al., 2014; Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Additionally, the theory argues that digitally sophisticated leaders are better suited to underwrite IT-backed projects improving organizational performance. Dijkstra (2019) indicated that digitally aware leaders can possibly improve the volume and quality of digital projects within an organization, leading to increased performance. Based on this, we suggest the following hypothesis:

H3. Digital leadership has a positive and significant relationship with firm performance.

Leader Distance as a Moderator

Even with advances in technologies and approaches designed to aid virtual teams, their dynamics are rather different from those of co-located teams. Virtual teams' constraints on physical contact and decreased information exchange require more concentrated coordination efforts to enable them to be effective. Leaders encounter increased challenges such as building trust, conflict, and communication when they work remotely. Physical distance also inhibits leadership, according to Zigurs (2003). Napier and Harris (1993) further contend that physical distance erases leadership and organizational performance, decoupling their attachment and eventually resulting in lower productivity. We therefore formulate the following hypothesis:

H4. Leader distance negatively moderates the relationship between green leadership and organizational performance.

H5. Leader distance negatively moderates the relationship between servant leadership and organizational performance.

H6. Leader distance negatively moderates the relationship between digital leadership and organizational performance.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilizes a descriptive design in hypothesis testing as indicated by systematic methodology and statistical tests. A quantitative method is utilized because the study aims to verify existing theories, with a focus on deductive reasoning and hypothesis testing. Data are collected using a survey approach, by way of questionnaires, to assess the impact of "green leadership, servant leadership, and digital leadership" on organizational performance. Cox and Hassard (2010) describe research design as a systematic framework guiding the entire research process. This study employed a "cross-sectional research design" to accomplish its objectives. This method entails gathering data from several cases at a specific point in time to obtain quantitative or measurable information, which is subsequently analyzed to identify patterns of relationships between two or more variables. Cooper and Schindler (2001) define a

population as the "potential respondents" selected for a study. In this research, the population comprises employees from Pakistan's textile industry who are knowledgeable about the leadership styles being studied and are impacted by their leaders' behavior. For practicality, the target population was narrowed down to employees from textile companies based in Karachi. A sample refers to a portion of the overall population. This research utilized "non-probability sampling," a method suitable when the researcher does not have extensive information about the participants. Specifically, the study employed the convenience sampling approach to select employees working in textile companies located in Karachi. As it is often impractical to gather data from an entire population (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010), researchers generally rely on a sample for their analysis (Cavana et al., 2001). For this research, the sample size was calculated using Rao's software, which estimated a sample of 377 with a 95% confidence level. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The demographic data of the respondents were captured in the first part, and the second part was dedicated to the research questions. The second part was also divided into four major topics, which were green leadership, servant leadership, digital leadership, and organizational performance.

Dependent Variable

A survey tool initially employed by Ahmed and Shafique (2014) was adapted to determine the dependent variable, organizational performance. The adapted instrument consisted of close-ended close questions framed on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." It consisted of 13 questions with Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE) values being reported as 0.892, 0.92, and 0.698, respectively. This instrument was tailored for the research, and validity was established by pilot testing.

Independent Variables

The independent variable of green leadership was measured by a tool previously used by Chen & Chang (2013) and Podsakoff et al. (1996). The scale was tailored to the present study and, in a pilot test, tested for its validity. Green leadership was dealt with five questions employing a five-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The second independent variable, servant leadership, was also assessed using a previously used tool by Salem et al. (2020). The adapted measure, for application in the current study, consisted of 13 items that were rated on a five-point Likert scale. This instrument was also tested for validity using a pilot test. For the third independent variable, digital leadership, a nine-item adapted questionnaire of Prince & Ann (2018) was used. This tool had nine closed-ended questions, also rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Its reliability was also determined in a pilot test.

Moderating Variable

In order to measure leader distance, the author adopted Le's (2020) method and used two generally accepted methods: physical distance and interaction frequency (Story et al., 2013). Physical distance is defined as geographical distance between leaders and staff. The greater the distance, the more costs and issues, including travel cost and schedule conflict. Participants in the study were asked if they shared an

office with their supervisor or manager. "No" was assigned a value of 0, and "yes" was assigned a value of 1. The second of the two measures used to determine leader distance, interaction frequency, is establishing how often employees and leaders meet face-to-face. Antonakis and Atwater (2002) propose that the leaders are "close" or "distant" depending on how frequently the interactions are seen. In order to support the current study, the participants were given a question asking them to report how often during the last half-year they sat down face-to-face with their direct supervisor. The question that was used was: "During the last six months, how often did you talk with your direct supervisor by face-to-face meetings? "Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from '1 = a few times a year or less' to '7 = many times a day.' More frequent contact denoted less leader distance, and reverse coding was applied to fit this construct into the study's measurement approach.".

Statistical Model: The statistical models for the study are as follows:

Model 1:

OP = B1 + B2GL + B3SL + B4DL +

Model 2:

OP = B1 + B2GL*LD* + *B3SL*LD + B4DL*LD + ε

Where:

OP = Organizational Performance
B1 = Intercept
B2, B3, B4 = Coefficients
GL = Green Leadership
SL = Servant Leadership
DL = Digital Leadership
LD = Leader Distance
ε = Error Term

Statistical Analysis: The statistical analysis involves the following methods, carried out using SPSS:

Descriptive Analysis: This method helps collect, present, and tabulate data using the following indexes.

- **Mean:** The average of a group of numbers.
- **Median:** Applied in cases of high variation between data points.
- **Standard Deviation:** Quantifies the amount of spreading or deviation from the mean value.
- **Skewness:** It gauges the amount of spread or deviation from the mean value.
- **Kurtosis:** Indicates whether data has heavier or lighter tailed variations than a normal distribution.

Correlation: This statistical technique is utilized to verify the association or strength of the relationship between variables. It is utilized in the present study to determine if the correlation coefficient is significant or not to run regression analysis in testing the hypothesis.

Regression: A predictive model approach that tries to examine the interaction between independent (predictor) and dependent (target) variables. It is used in trying to determine the cause and effect relationship of the variables.

Diagnostic Test: This is performed in order to validate that statistical analysis conditions are satisfied. The principal concerns are:

Multicollinearity: It occurs when two or more independent variables are so closely related that one predictor variable can be used to predict the other.

Cronbach's Alpha: It can be employed in order to check the internal consistency or the reliability of a questionnaire, especially that of ones which have Likert scales and numerous questions.

Variance Inflation Factor (VIF): Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is a test for multicollinearity in regression analysis. VIF indicates to what degree the variance is inflated in the presence of a regression coefficient if the data are multicollinear.

RESULTS

Output of the statistical tests was tabulated and first analyzed using Excel before being transferred to SPSS for analysis.

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis provides a broad overview of the statistical properties of the data by calculating the mean and standard deviation, measuring the degree of variability in terms of the mean. In addition, skewness is examined to determine the degree to which the data is symmetrical in spread, and kurtosis measures the severity of its tails, deciding whether they are drawn out or truncated.

Table 1.
Descriptive Analysis of Variables

Variables	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
GL	377	3.5833	0.71514	-0.186	4.54
SL	377	3.6700	0.69957	-0.092	-0.188
DL	377	2.9133	0.89171	-0.026	0.074
OP	377	2.7000	0.99665	0.180	-0.790
LD	377	2.9200	0.99665	0.180	-0.790

Table 1 shows a summary of the descriptive statistics. Skewness of -0.5 to 0.5 confirms that the distributions are almost symmetric. The kurtosis below 3 suggests that the measures have short-tailed distributions. The standard deviation and mean of all of the variables have also been summarized.

Correlation Analysis: This research examines the correlation coefficient to analyze the linear relationships between various variables.

Table 2.
Correlation Analysis of Variables

Variables	OP	GL	SL	DL	LD

Organizational Performance	1	0.199	0.275	0.456	0.182%
Green leadership	0.199	1	0.687	0.342	0.283
Servant leadership	0.275	0.687	1	0.383	0.128
Digital leadership	0.456	0.342	0.383	1	0.197
Leader distance	0.182%	0.283	0.128	0.197	1

Significance level: denotes significance at 1%

The table shows that green leadership and servant leadership have the strongest correlation, while green leadership and organizational performance have the weakest correlation (0.199). All the correlation coefficients are close to 1 and positive, with a 1% significance level, which implies there are very strong meaningful correlations among the variables. Since there are these strong significant correlations, the next logical step is to use regression analysis to investigate the relationships further.

Diagnostic Analysis: A diagnostic analysis was carried out to evaluate the data's reliability and check for multicollinearity using the following approaches:

Reliability Test: The Cronbach's alpha test was utilized to assess the internal consistency and reliability of the Five-Point Likert scale used in the study.

Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha Values for Each Variable: The table shows the reliability values of different variables. The Cronbach's Alpha for green leadership (GL) is 0.635, which is much more than the acceptable rate. Similarly, values for supportive leadership (SL) and directive leadership (DL) are also satisfactory. Notably, leader distance (LD) is the most reliable with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.892.

Multicollinearity Analysis: Multicollinearity is the situation where independent variables highly correlate with each other and can make data analysis useless and yield false statistical findings. Multicollinearity in this research was established using VIF and tolerance tests.

Regression Analysis (Model 1): The regression analysis was used to ascertain the strength and nature of the relationships among variables. This analysis enabled testing the combined effect of green, supportive, and directive leadership on organizational performance. The statistical equation for Model 1 is: OP = B1 + BGL. The findings reveal minimal multicollinearity, as the VIF values are less than 10 and the tolerance values exceed 0.1, verifying that multicollinearity does not pose a problem in this dataset.

Table 5: Model Summary: Table depicts goodness-of-fit of the regression model on correlation between organizational performance and the green, servant, and digital leadership paradigms. With adjusted R-squared value of 0.549, it indicates statistical significance of the model explaining 54.9% variation in organizational performance.

Table 4.
Multicollinearity Values

Variables	Tolerence	VIF
GL	0.641	1.559
SL	0.606	1.650
DL	0.848	1.179

Table 6.
Regression Matrix Model

Model	Coefficient	Standard Error	T-Value	P-Value
Constant	0.701	0.296	2.703	0.007
GL	0.096	0.099	-0.587	0.557
SL	0.091	0.103	2.000	0.046
DL	0.543	0.063	7.420	0.000

Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance (OP)

F-statistic: 27.944

Significance Level (p-value): 0.000

The table shows regression coefficients and statistical significance of the correlations between organizational performance and three leadership styles. The coefficient of green leadership is 0.096 but is not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). Servant leadership, with a coefficient of 0.091, is statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. Digital leadership shows a high positive correlation, as evident from a coefficient of 0.543 and a highly significant p-value of 0.000.

Regression Equation: Drawing on these results, the regression equation used to forecast organizational performance is outlined as follows:

OP = 0.701 + 0.096GL + 0.091SL + 0.543DL: This equation illustrates the collective influence of green, servant, and digital leadership on organizational performance.

Model 2: Moderation Analysis: Moderation analysis was conducted to determine the effect of leader distance (LD) on the relationship between leadership styles and organizational performance (OP). The findings indicate that LD has a negative moderating impact on the relationship between GL and OP (H4: B = -0.552, t = 3.706, P < 0.005) and also on the relationship between SL and OP (H5: B = -0.523, t = 3.706, P < 0.005). Conversely, LD significantly moderates the relationship between digital leadership (DL) and OP (H6: B = 0.362, t = 2.578, P < 0.005).

Table 7.
Moderation Analysis Results

Variable	Coefficient (B)	T-Value	P-value
GL*LD	-0.552	3.706	0.000
SL*LD	-0.523	3.796	0.000
DL*LD	0.362	2.578	0.010

Table8.
Results Discussion

Hypothesis	Finding	Result
H1	Green leadership has not significant impact on OP	Not Supported
H2	Sevent leadership positively and significant impact on OP	Supported
H3	Digital leadership positively and significantly impact on OP	Supported
H4	Leader distance negatively moderates the relationship between GL and OP	Supported
H5	Leader distance negatively moderates the relationship between SL and OP	Supported
H6	Leader distance positively moderates the relationship between DL and OP	Partially Supported

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the interaction between different leadership styles and organizational performance among textile-based organizations, with a focus on the moderating effect of leader distance. The results indicated that green leadership did not significantly contribute to organizational performance, while servant and digital leadership significantly and positively contributed. Additionally, leader distance moderated these relationships such that it undermined the impact of green and servant leadership but augmented the impact of digital leadership. The results emphasize the significance of context-sensitive leadership as well as positive leader proximity for improving organizational outcomes. The research examined the impact of green, servant, and digital leadership styles on the performance of textile organizations, both expected and unexpected. The primary aim was to examine the relationship between green leadership and organizational performance through hypothesis H1. Contrary to past studies (Asbari, 2020; Crossman, 2011; Egri & Herman, 2000; Kitsis & Chen, 2021; Mayer et al., 2012; Noorliza, 2020; Slamet, 2020), the results did not have any statistical relationship. The explanation for this variation may be that the main emphasis of green leadership is on environmental performance, which is not necessarily directly linked with overall organizational success. The second objective investigated the relationship between servant leadership and organizational performance.

The result set up a significant and positive connection, as prescribed in the previous researches (Albloshi, 2015; Koesmono, 2014; Muller et al., 2018; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Sendjaya et al., 2008; Van Dierendonck, 2011). It argues that servant leadership improves employee productivity and, in doing so, organizational performance is improved. The third aim targeted digital leadership. During hypothesis H3 testing, the research established a positive and significant relationship between organizational performance and digital leadership, consistent with past research (Egelhoff, 1991; Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Nonaka et al., 1996; Verhoef et al., 2019). The discovery is proof of Dijkstra's (2019) assertion that digitally aware leaders spearhead initiatives that contribute to organizational performance. In regard to leader distance as a

moderator, the research established that it significantly and negatively influenced the connection between digital leadership and servant leadership and organizational performance. Leader distance was positively found to moderate the connection between digital leadership and organizational performance. These findings are consistent with those in previous research (Rosen, Furst-Holloway, & Blackburn, 2007; Zigurs, 2003; Hoch & Kozlowski, 2013).

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This research offers descriptive information on how three leadership styles affect organizational performance and contributes to the knowledge base by examining their combined impact. The findings support the Resource-Based View (RBV) and AMO theory. The inclusion of leader distance as a moderator contributes to the models that exist and supports them through empirical research. The overall model, integrating all factors under one theory, offers a more sophisticated explanation of what constitutes an effective leader. Extensions to continue researching other variables affecting leadership can contribute to continuing this research in other directions. The research cites the necessity for appropriate leadership styles being applied by leaders according to the needs of an organization. Servant and digital leadership are especially emphasized as especially applicable, and green leadership demands a specific means of translating environmental success into total organizational success.

Awareness of leader distance can also enable managers to promote more effective leadership relationships for the purpose of enhancing performance. This study offers valuable insights to managers, especially in settings where most previous research has concentrated on developed nations (Iqbal et al., 2019), as they tend to have Western perspectives. By examining a few leadership approaches in the textile industry, which is one of Pakistan's prominent economic industries, this research presents useful suggestions to determine leadership styles that improve organizational performance. This research highlights the significance of the determination of leadership practices' effectiveness and potential as they have significant impacts on employee productivity. The purpose of this study is to enhance knowledge regarding the role of leadership in the success of an organization in developing and underdeveloped nations like Pakistan. Additionally, it inspires other organizations to implement the best leadership practices for maximizing internal functioning and productivity. Managers can utilize these insights in an effort to initiate initiatives that improve service delivery and contribute organizational value.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

The research, although helpful, has certain limitations. First, it was a cross-sectional study design where data were collected from various textile firms at a single point in time. The study utilized a survey with closed-ended questionnaires on five-point or seven-point Likert scales. Second, convenience sampling was utilized owing to ease of access to participants, potentially limiting the generalizability of the findings to the wider population. Third, the study only focused on textile firms in Karachi and did not consider other areas.

FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

To overcome the limitation, a number of suggestions for future studies are made. Probability sampling techniques must be employed so that there are more targeted and generalizable findings. Since digital leadership is a new phenomenon in Pakistan, more exploration needs to be done based on sophisticated statistical methods to unearth inner meanings.Introducing mediating variables would enable the study of mediate relationships between organizational performance and leadership styles, providing useful knowledge for leadership practice.

DECLARATIONS

Acknowledgement: We appreciate the generous support from all the supervisors and their different affiliations.
Funding: No funding body in the public, private, or nonprofit sectors provided a particular grant for this research.
Availability of data and material: In the approach, the data sources for the variables are stated.
Authors' contributions: Each author participated equally to the creation of this work.
Conflicts of Interests: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Consent to Participate: Yes
Consent for publication and Ethical approval: Because this study does not include human or animal data, ethical approval is not required for publication. All authors have given their consent.

REFERENCES

Abbatiello, A., Knight, M., Philpot, S., & Roy, I. (2017). Leadership disrupted. Rewriting the Rules for the Digital Age, 76-85. Deloitte University Press.

Ahmed, M., & Shafiq, S. (2014). The impact of organizational culture on organizationa performance: a case study on the telecom sector. Global journal of management and business research.

Akkaya, B., & Tabak, A. (2020). The link between organizational agility and leadership: A research in science parks. Academy of Strategic Management Jornal, 19(1), 1-17.

Albloshi, F.A., Nawar, Y.S. (2015), Assessing the impact of leadership styles on organizational performance: The case of Saudi private SMEs. Journal of Organizational Studies and Innovation, 2(2), 66-77

Anderson, A. R. (1998). Cultivating the Garden of Eden: environmental entrepreneuring. Journal of Organizational Change Management.

Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader distance: A review and a proposed theory. The Leadership Quarterly, 13(6), 673-704. doi: 10.1016/S 1048-9843(02)00 155-8 Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., Kalleberg, A. L., & Bailey, T. A. (2000). Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off. Cornell University Press.

Asbari, M. (2020). Is Transformational Leadership Suitable for Future Organizational Needs? nternational Journal of Social, Policy and Law, 1(1), 51-55.

Asbari, M., Hyun, C. C., Wijayanti, L. M., WINANTI, W., Fayzhall, M., & Putra, F. (2020). Hard Skills Dan Soft Skills: Apa Membangun Inovasi Guru Sekolah Islam? Journal EVALUASI, 4(1), 143. https:doi.org/10.32478/evaluasi.v4il.362

Ashari, R. (2020). The Role of Transformational Leadership, Sharing Knowledge, and Emotional Intelligence on Organizational Performance. Konferensi Nasional Imu Administrasi, 4(1), 1-7.

Barbuto Jr, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. Group & Organization Management, 31(3), 300-326.

Barney, J. (199l). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Managemnent, 17(1), 99-120.

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14(2), 103-118.

Bednarek, P., Schneider, B., Svatos, A., Oldham, N. J., & Hahlbrock, K. (2005). Structural complexity, differential response to infection, and tissue specificity of indolic and phenylpropanoid secondary metabolism in Arabidopsis roots. Plant Physiology, 138(2), 1058-1070.

Boiral, O., Cayer, M., & Baron, C. M. (2009). The action logics of environmental leadership: A developmental perspective. Journal of Business Ethics, 85(4), 479-499.

Bos-Nehles, A. C., Van Riemsdijk, M. J., & Kees Looise, J. (2013). Employee perceptions of line management performance: applying the AMO theory to explain the effectiveness of line managers' HRM implementation. Human resource management, 52(6),861-877.

Boxall, P. and Steenveld, M. (1999) Human resource strategy and competitive advantage: A longitudinal study of engineering consultancies, Journal of Management Studies, 36(4), pp.443-63.

Busenitz, L. W., & Barney, J. B. (1997). Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. Journal of Business Venturing, 12(1),9-30.

Cavana, R., Delahaye, B., & Sekeran, U. (2001). Applied business research: Qualitative and quantitative methods. John Wiley & Sons.

Chen, Y. S., & Chang. C. H. (2013). The determinants of green product development performance: Green dynamic capabilities, green transformational leadership, and green creativity. Journal of Business Ethics, 116(1), 107-119.

Chien, M. H. (2004). A study to improve organizational performance: A view from SHRM. Journal of the American Academy of Business, 4(1/2), 289-29 1.

Choudhary, A. I., Akhtar, S. A., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of transformational and servant leadership on organizational performance: A comparative analysis. Journal of Business Ethics, 116(2), 433-440.

Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. (2001). S, 2001, Business Research Methods. McGraw, New York.

Cox, J. W., & Hassard, J. (2010). Recontextualization in a Public Health Setting. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 46), 119-145.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). Educational research: Planming, conducting, and evaluating quantitative (p. 676). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Cres well, J. W. (2003). A framework for design. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches, 9-11.

Crisp, C. B., & Jarvenpaa, S. L. (2013). Swift trust in global virtual teams. Journal of Personnel Psychology.Crossman, B., & Crossman, J. (2011). Conceptualising followership-a review of the literature. Leadership, 74),481-497.

Daft, R. L. (2000). Organization Theory and Design (7th Ed.). South-Western College Publishing.Thomson Learning. US.A

De Waal, A., & Sivro, M. (2012). The relation between servant leadership, organizational performance, and the high-performance organization framework. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 19(2), 173-190.

Dijkstra, J. (2020). Digital Leadership and Firm Performance: a Meta-Analysis (Doctoral dissertation).

Ding, F., Li, D., & George, J. F. (2014). Investigating the effects of IS strategic leadership on organizational benefits from the perspective of CIO strategic roles. Information & Managemnent, 51(7), 865-879. https:/ldoi.org/10,1016/1.im.2014.08.004

Distefano, J.J. and Maznevski, M.L. (2000) Creating value with diverse teams in global management', Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.45-63

Egelhoff, W.G. (199). Information-processing theory and the multinational enterprise. Journal of International Business Studies, 22(3), 341-368.

Egri, C. P., & Herman, S. (2000). Leadership in the North American environmental sector: Values, leadership styles, and contexts of environmental leaders and their organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 43(4), 571-604.

Gerhart, B. (2005). Human resources and business performance: Findings, unanswered questions, and an alternative approach. Management revue, 174-185.

Gibson, C. B., & Cohen, S. G. (Eds.). (2003). Virtual teams that work: Creating conditions for virtual team effectiveness. John Wiley & Sons.

Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M.T., Jones Young, N. C., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2015). Virtual teams rescarch: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. Journal of Management, 41(5), 1313-1337.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). The servant as leader Indianapolis: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center, 1-37.

Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. Leadership, 3(4), 397-417.

Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Echelons: of the reflection its organization as top management. Academy of Management Review Management., 9(2), 193-206.

Hamon, T.T. (2003). Organizational effectiveness as explained by social structre in a faith-based business network organization. unpublished doctoral dissertation, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.

Hansen, G. S., & Wernerfelt, B. (1989). Determinants of firm performance: The relative importance of economic and organizational factors. Strategic management journal, 10(5), 399-411.

Hinds, P. J., & Bailey, D. E. (2003). Out of sight, out of sync: Understanding conflict in distributed teams. Organization Science, 14(6), 615-632.

Howell, J. P., Bowen, D. E., Dorfman, P. W., Kerr, S., & Podsakoff, P. M. (1990). Substitutes for leadership: Effective alternatives to ineffective leadership. Organizational Dynamics, 19(1), 21-38.

Javier, J. (2002). A review paper on organizational culture and organizational performance. International Journal of Business and Social Science, I(3), 52-76.

Karp, D, G. (1996). Values and their effect on pro-environmental behavior. Environment and Behavior, 28(1), 111-133.

Khan, A. A., & Khan, M. (20 10). Pakistan textile industry facing new challenges. Research Journal of International Studies, 14(14), 21-29.

Kitsis, A. M., & Chen, I. J. (2021). Do stakeholder pressures influence green supply chain Practices? Exploring the mediating role of top management commitment. Journal of Cleaner Production, 316, 128258.

Koesmono, H. T. (2014). The influence of organizational culture, servant leadership, and job satisfaction toward organizational commitment and job performance through work motivation as moderating variables for lecturers in economics and management of private universities in east Surabaya. Educational Research International, 3(4), 25-39.

Le, T. (2020). SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND ABUSIVE LEADERSHIP ON EMPLOYEE WORK ENGAGEMENT: THE ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY AND LEADER DISTANCE.

Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. Academy of Management Journal, 55(1), 151-171.

McCann, J. T., Graves, D., & Cox, L. (2014). Servant leadership, employee satisfaction, and organizational performance in rural community hospitals. International journal of Business and Management, 9(10), 28-38.

McGrath, J. E. (1991). Time, interaction, and performance (TIP) A Theory of Groups. Small group research, 22(2), 147-174.

Muller, R., Smith, E., & Lillah, R. (2018). Perceptions regarding the impact of servant leadership on organisational performance in the Eastern Cape. International Journal of Business and Management Studies, 1O(1), 46-62.

Napier, B.J., & Ferris, G. R. (1993). Distance in organizations. Human Resource Management Review, 3(4), 321-357. doi: 10.1016/1053-4822(93)90004-N

Peñarroja, V., Orengo, V., Zornoza, A., & Hernández, A. (2013). The effects of virtuality level on task-related collaborative behaviors: The mediating role of team trust. Computers in Human Behavior, 29(3), 967-974.

Peterson, S. J., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: Exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. Personel Psychology, 65(3), 565-596.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S.B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Management, 22(2), 259-298.

Porter, M. E., & Van der Linde, C. (1995). Toward a new conception of the environment-competitiveness relationship. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 9(4), 97-118.

Prince, K. A. (2018). Digital Leadership: Transitioning into the digital age (Doctoral dissertation, James Cook University).

Purvanova, R. K., & Bono, J. E. (2009). Transformational leadership in context: Face-to-face and virtual teams. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(3),343-357.

Reinke, S. J. (2004). Poverty Alleviation Course_Reading 8_SERVICE BEFORE SELE: TOWARDS A THEORY OF SERVANT-LEADERSHIP.

Rhodes, J., Lok, P., Hung, R. Y. Y., & Fang, S. C. (2008). An integrative model of organizational learning and social capital on effective knowledge transfer and perceived organizational performance. Journal of Workplace Learning.

Ricardo, R., & Wade, D. (2001). Corporate Performance Management: How to Build a Better Organization Through Measurement Driven Strategies Alignment. Butterworth Heinemann.

Rosen, B.,Furst-Holloway, S., & Blackburn, R. (2007). Overcoming barriers to knowledge sharing in virtual teams. Organizational Dynamics ORGAN DYN, 36, 259-273. doi: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2007.04.007

Sabherwal, R., Sabherwal, S., Havakhor, T., & Steelman, Z. (2019). How does strategic alignment affect firm performance? The roles of information technology investment and environmental uncertainty. MIS Quarterly, 43(2), 453-474.

Saleem, F., Zhang, Y. Z., Gopinath, C., & Adeel, A. (2020). Impact of servant leadership on performance: The mediating role of affective and cognitive trust. SAGE Open, 101), 2158244019900562.

Schneider, S. K., & George, W. M. (2011). Servant leadership versus transformational leadership in voluntary service organizations. ZLeadership & Organization Developnent Journal.

Sendjaya, S. (2015). Personal and Organizational Excellence through Servant Leadership Learning to Serve, Serving to Lead, Leading to Transform. Springe.

Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J.C. and Santora, J.C. (2008), "Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations", Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 402-24.

Sihombing, S., Astuti, E. S., Al Musadieq, M., Hamied, D., & Rahardjo, K. (2018). The effect of servant leadership on rewards, organizational culture and its implication for employee's performance. International Journal of Law and Management.

Sipior, J. C. (2020). Considerations for the development and use of AI in response to COVID-19. International Journal of Information Management, 55, 102170.

Slamet, M. U. A. G., Asdiana, ., Abdillah, . A., Abduloh, ., Fahlevi,. M., Ali,.R., Evanirosa,

Mufid, . A., Purwanto, . A., Faricha, . F., Khairullah, .& Zumaro,. A. (2020) Islamic Leadership Model for Indonesian Millennial Markets Performance in Pharmaceutical Schools. Systematic Reviews in Pharmaceutical, 11 (8), 374-382. doi: 10.3 1838/srp.2020.8.55

Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. Journal of International Business Studies, 41(4), 690-709.

Story, J. S. P., Youssef, C. M., Luthans, F., Barbuto, J. E., & Bovaird, J. (2013). Contagion effect of global leaders' positive psychological capital on followers: Does distance and quality of relationship matter? International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24(13), 2534-2553. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2012.744338

Sweeney, S. J., Phillips, A. F., Adams, A. R.,O'reilly, E. P., & Thijs, P. J. A. (1998). The effect of temperature-dependent processes on the performance of 1.5-um compressively strained InGaAs (P) MQW semiconductor diode lasers. IEEE Photonics Technology Letters, 10(8), 1076-1078.

Takeuchi, R., Lepak, D. P., Wang, H., & Takeuchi, K. (2007). An empirical examination of the mechanisms mediating between high-performance work systems and the performance of Japanese organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(4), 1069.

Trovik,S.J., and McGivernM.(1997). Determinants of Organizational Performance. Management Decision.356, 417-435.

Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. Journal of Business Research, 122, 889-901.

Zigurs, I. (2003). Leadership in virtual teams: Oxymoron or opportunity? Organizational Dynamics, 31(4), 339-35 1. doi: 10.1016/S0090-2616(02)00132-8