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This paper is concerned with the ways in which transactional and transformational leadership styles can improve the service performance of front-line staff. Past literature on services marketing has indicated the importance of leadership but has largely ignored the parallel literature in which leadership styles have been conceptualized and operationalized (e.g., sales management, organizational psychology). This paper seeks to build upon existing services marketing theory by introducing the role of leadership styles in enhancing service performance. Consequently, a conceptual framework of the effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on service performance, anchored in a cross-disciplinary literature review, is developed. Managerial implications and future research directions are also discussed.

In today’s business environment, the role of service provision has gained considerable momentum (Slotegraaf, 1997). Noticeably, organizations are moving away from a selling focus towards a services focus in an attempt to satisfy the needs of customers more efficiently and effectively (Anderson, 1996). In this context, service quality is recognized as a means of achieving differentiation, customer value, and satisfaction (Ozment and Morash, 1994; Schlesinger and Heskett, 1991). In fact, “levels of service which may have been tolerated only a generation ago are now regarded as unacceptable” (Donnelly and Shiu, 1999, p. 498). In addition, Lux, Jex, and Hansen (1996, p. 65) point out that “in the year 2000, it is estimated that service producing
industries will employ 71 percent of those workers engaged in paid employment.”

The issue of enhancing the quality of services offered is therefore “one of the most important problems facing management today” (Cronin and Taylor, 1992, p. 55).

Much of the current literature available on the topic of service quality deals with its measurement or outcome rather than the process by which the service is delivered (Farrell and Souchon, 1998), despite the fact that the process of service delivery is sometimes rated as more important than its outcome (Chenet, Tynan, and Money, 1999). Nevertheless, a limited number of studies have attempted to identify means of improving service quality delivery (e.g., Hartline and Ferrell, 1996). In particular, the role of service leadership in enhancing customer-contact staff performance levels (i.e., customers’ perceptions of service quality) has previously been noticed (e.g., Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996). However, despite the fact that a lack of service leadership appears to be a major cause of “service malaise” (Stutts, 1999), little, if any, empirical literature can be found on this topic.

Though service leadership has been deemed crucial to the provision of higher levels of service quality delivery (Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996), the question of how service managers lead (or should lead) still remains. To fill this noticeable research gap, the study of service leadership should draw from the leadership styles literature common, for example, within the sales management field. Here, leadership styles are considered to be two-dimensional encompassing transformational and transactional leadership (e.g., Bass, 1990; 1997; Jolson, Dubinsky, Yammarino, and Comer, 1993; Russ, McNeilly, and Comer, 1996). The focus of a transactional leader is on an exchange process whereby s/he will secure the work effort of followers through the use of implied incentives (Bass and Avolio, 1990). Further, transactional leaders practice management-by-exception (whereby deviations from set standards are corrected by the leader as per Bass, 1997). By contrast, transformational leaders secure the work effort by raising the “consciousness of followers about the importance of outcomes and how to reach those outcomes by going beyond their own self-interests” (Bass, 1997, p. 21). More specifically, a transformational leader is charismatic, inspirationally motivating, intellectually stimulating, and individually considerate to followers (Bass, 1997; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). The antithesis to leading is laissez-faire (or non-leadership), where subordinates are left to their own devices and receive no supervisory input (Avolio,
Waldman, and Yammarino, 1991; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). Differentiation is provided in that, whilst transactional and transformational represent leadership styles, laissez-faire represents an absence of leadership (Bass, 1997).

In the words of Bass (1997, p. 19), “by dissecting leadership as transformational and transactional, we have learned a lot about what makes leaders more effective in their efforts to reach mutually satisfying objectives with their followers.” Yammarino (1997, p. 43) further states that “the particular leadership style or behavior endorsed by the manager can enhance, neutralize, or inhibit such job-related outcomes and responses of sales subordinates as job satisfaction, motivation, effectiveness, and performance.” If similar outcomes are posited for a service environment, and bearing in mind the importance of service leadership in achieving successful service delivery (Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996), the study of leadership in services marketing would benefit from the integration of transactional and transformational leadership styles into a conceptualization of service leadership.

The objective of this paper is therefore to conceptualize the effect of leadership styles on the performance of front-line staff in service organizations, drawing on generic leadership styles conceptualized in psychology and sales management literature. From a theoretical point of view, the conceptual model developed will make two key contributions. Firstly, though a plethora of articles conceptualizing and operationalizing service quality exists, the service quality enhancement literature (in particular the study of service leadership effects) is still in a state of relative infancy. Secondly, the cross-disciplinary approach employed here is a novel way of investigating service leadership. Furthermore, the effects of leadership styles in a service context have, to the authors’ best knowledge, received little, if any, attention in services marketing literature to date. From a managerial perspective, the model will improve our understanding of how overall service quality can be enhanced through displaying appropriate leadership styles. More specifically, the model should allow leaders in service organizations to knowingly display leadership styles more likely to strengthen a service-oriented culture.

**Background**

Leadership is widely recognized as a medium for influencing subordinates’ actions (Bass, 1985; 1997; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995;
Jolson, Dubinsky, Yammarino, and Comer, 1993; Russ, McNeilly, and Comer, 1996). In his recent work, Yammarino (1997, p. 44) identified various definitions of leadership, the majority of which focus upon “the ability of an individual […] to get others […] to accomplish things […] in a particular situation.” This somewhat general statement can be applied to services marketing to formulate a tentative definition of service leadership. Service leadership can be viewed as the instillation by service managers of an organizational customer focus amongst customer-contact employees aimed at inspiring and sustaining a continual commitment towards achieving a level of service that customers want and for which they are willing to pay (c.f., Stutts, 1999; Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996). Service leadership is likely to impact upon service performance through a variety of managerial and front-line staff factors. The linkages between these managerial and front-line staff factors and service performance represent the platform upon which leadership style effects are modelled in this paper. Therefore, these linkages will now be presented, based upon a review of the services marketing literature.

The fact that customer-contact employees play a crucial role in the development of customers’ perceptions of service quality is already well-grounded within the services marketing literature (e.g., Bitner, 1990; Hartline and Ferrell, 1996; Mohr and Bitner, 1995). Employees’ attitudes and behaviors during service encounters are evaluated by customers who, in turn, derive a certain satisfaction with the encounter based upon these perceptions (Bitner, 1990; Bitner, Booms, and Tetreault, 1990; Mohr and Bitner, 1995; Sweeney, Johnson, and Armstrong, 1992). The most important behaviors of employees, in terms of customers’ perceptions of service quality, are employee prosocial service behaviors (Kelley and Hoffman, 1997; Sweeney, Johnson, and Armstrong, 1992).

Employee prosocial service behaviors are defined as behaviors performed by front-line staff during service encounters with the intention of promoting customer satisfaction while carrying out the employee’s organizational role (c.f., Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; Kelley and Hoffman, 1997). They are grouped into four dimensions, based upon the focus of the behavior (i.e., towards fellow employees or towards organizational customers) and the reason for the behavior (i.e., whether the employee’s behavior is compulsory or discretionary) (c.f., Bettencourt and Brown, 1997; Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; Kelley and Hoffman, 1997). Examples of prosocial behaviors are given in Table 1.
Table 1. Examples of Customer-Contact Employee Prosocial Service Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Prosocial Behavior</th>
<th>Illustrative Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compulsory Co-operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Socialization</td>
<td>Dubinsky, Howell, Ingram, and Bellenger (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Teamwork</td>
<td>Harris (1992-1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compulsory Customer Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Recovery</td>
<td>Hart, Heskett, and Sasser (1990); Zeithaml and Bitner (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Reflexivity (adaptability/spontaneity)</td>
<td>Burton (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Altruism</td>
<td>Morrison (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Civic virtue</td>
<td>O’Bannon and Pearce (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Morrison (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Sportsmanship</td>
<td>O’Bannon and Pearce (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discretionary Customer Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Truly out-of-the-ordinary behavior</td>
<td>Bitner, Booms, and Tetreault (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enhancement of employees’ prosocial service behaviors is of paramount importance in services marketing as such behaviors positively affect customers’ perceptions of service quality (e.g., Bitner, 1990; Bitner, Booms, and Tetreault, 1990; Hartline and Ferrell, 1996; Kelley and Hoffman, 1997). In this context, improving employee prosocial service behaviors is dependent upon a number of work factors such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, role conflict and role ambiguity (c.f., Singh, 1998; Smith, Organ, and Near, 1983). These work factors can be categorized as role stressors and role enhancers. Role stressors are perceptions of job characteristics which have a negative impact upon an employee’s likelihood of performing prosocial service behaviors; conversely, role enhancers are defined as job-specific psychological attitudes deemed to have a positive impact upon an employee’s likelihood of performing prosocial service behaviors (c.f., Singh, 1998). For instance, in a survey of insurance company employees, both job satisfaction and organizational commitment (important role enhancers) were found to positively influence most employee organizational citizenship behaviors (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne, 1998). The reason given for this was that job satisfaction and commitment motivate employees to perform organizational citizenship behaviors voluntarily (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne, 1998). Table 2 illustrates examples of role stressors and enhancers.
In turn, given the importance of role stressors and role enhancers in respectively reducing and increasing ultimate perceptions of service quality (albeit through prosocial service behaviors), it becomes paramount for management to be able to control these two work factor categories. A major objective of service managers’ roles will be to reduce subordinates’ role stressors (e.g., role conflict) and increase their role enhancers (e.g., job satisfaction) (c.f., Bowen and Lawler, 1995; Hartline and Ferrell, 1996; Rogers, Cash, and Klow, 1994; Singh, 1998; Singh, Verbeke, and Rhoads, 1993; Tietjen and Myers, 1998). For example, empowerment of employees and feedback provided by management have been found to increase job satisfaction and commitment (Singh, 1998). Some examples of managerial roles are illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3. Examples of Managerial Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Roles</th>
<th>Illustrative Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of employees</td>
<td>Bowen and Lawler (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing appropriate task resources</td>
<td>Schneider and Bowen (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing employee participation</td>
<td>Dubinsky, Howell, Ingram, and Bellenger (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altering job tasks for variety</td>
<td>Hackman and Oldham (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training / development of employees</td>
<td>Román, Ruiz, and Munuera (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel selection techniques</td>
<td>Preece and Ward (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to employees</td>
<td>Jaworski and Kohli (1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous discussion has highlighted the relationships between managerial and front-line employee factors and ultimate service performance and shown the importance of these in improving service. The next section will model how leadership styles can further enhance the effectiveness of these managerial and employee factors.

**Conceptualization**

Previous research has demonstrated that transactional and transformational leadership are both common to high performing sales managers (Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995; Russ, McNeilly, and Comer, 1996), as opposed to a laissez-faire approach, which has been found to have little or no effect upon sales performance (Bass, 1997; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). However, no specific studies have examined leadership and its relationship to service performance (i.e., customers’ perceptions of service quality).

A service manager should adopt the managerial roles contained within Table 3 as part of his/her job description (e.g., Hackman and Oldham, 1975; Román, Ruiz, and Munuera, 1999) in order to be effective (c.f., Bowen and Lawler, 1995; Dubinsky, Howell, Ingram, and Bellenger, 1986). However, amongst service managers, there will be those who lead and those who do not (c.f., Bass, 1997). Those managers who do not lead (i.e., those who adopt a laissez-faire approach) generally leave employees to their own devices and offer no supervisory input (Avolio, Waldman, and Yammarino, 1991; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). This means that, after the initial expression of managerial roles a laissez-faire service manager has no future leadership input (c.f., Bass, 1997). In contrast to this, both transactional and transformational service leaders are likely to have an ongoing involvement after the initial expression of managerial roles. The reward-oriented philosophy of a transactional leader results in clear expectations being discussed with, and set for, subordinates (Russ, McNeilly, and Comer, 1996) whilst a transformational leader will place greater emphasis upon the personal development of employees (e.g., Boehnke, DiStefano, DiStefano, and Bontis, 1997), both of which characterize a level of ongoing involvement. Managerial roles performed over a period of time will be more effective in reducing front-line employee role stressors and increasing front-line employee role enhancers than will managerial roles performed on a one-off basis. For example, a front-line service employee who, from the outset, is
empowered by his/her manager but then receives no further managerial support may find him/herself experiencing greater levels of role ambiguity and thereby lesser job satisfaction. Empowerment alone will not necessarily result in increased levels of job satisfaction or decreased levels of role ambiguity. Rather, to be effective, empowerment has to be provided under the direction of management (Bowen and Lawler, 1995).

Thus, leadership of employees, be it transactional or transformational, will increase the effectiveness of managerial roles in terms of reducing employee role stressors and increasing role enhancers. Having said this, the increase in managerial role effectiveness will differ between leaders since transformational leaders are considered more effective than transactional leaders (Bass, 1990; 1997; Boehnke, DiStefano, DiStefano, and Bontis, 1997).

By definition, a transactional leader is short-term in his/her dealings with staff (Russ, McNeilly, and Comer, 1996). Managerial roles performed by a transactional service leader, while ongoing, are likely to constitute a series of discrete interactions (e.g., providing feedback in the form of mistake correction). A transformational leader is more long-term when dealing with staff, focusing upon the development of employees (e.g., Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). Managerial roles performed by a transformational service leader are continuous in their nature (e.g., training employees through continuous coaching and mentoring as per Boehnke, DiStefano, DiStefano, and Bontis, 1997). The previous argument leads to the following being proposed:

\[ H1: \text{Leadership styles will strengthen the relationship between managerial roles and service staff role stressors and role enhancers. Moreover, a transformational leader will strengthen the relationship between his/her managerial roles and front-line staff role stressors and enhancers to a greater degree than a transactional leader.} \]

A multidisciplinary literature review uncovered that little research exists with regards to the effects of leadership styles upon role stressors and enhancers. Drawing from the sales-specific research that does exist, transformational leadership has been found to affect employees’ commitment, trust, and satisfaction positively (Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990), and role ambiguity negatively (Dubinsky,
Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). Transactional leadership has also been found to be positively associated with job satisfaction and commitment (Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). However, no significant differences have been found between the effects of transactional and transformational leadership styles upon salespersons’ role stressors and enhancers, despite hypotheses to the contrary (e.g., Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995; Russ, McNeilly, and Comer, 1996). This surprising result has been attributed to a lack of close geographical proximity between superiors and subordinates (i.e., salespersons working in other cities as per Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). However, a successful service leader is characterized by an “in the field” approach, whereby they work closely with their subordinates (Berry, 1991; Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996). Therefore, relationships proposed by Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler (1995)\(^1\) can be similarly expected in a services context. Specifically, a service manager who adopts a transactional or transformational leadership style will optimize his/her staff’s role stressors and role enhancers, although transformational leadership is posited to have more pronounced effects.

The previous discussion leads to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

\[ H2: \text{Leadership styles will reduce front-line staff role stressors and increase front-line staff role enhancers. Moreover, transformational leadership will reduce role stressors and increase role enhancers to a greater degree than transactional leadership.} \]

In a service setting, researchers have suggested that staff generally have a willingness to provide good service to customers (c.f., Bitner, Booms, and Mohr, 1994; Schneider, 1980). Transformational leaders are noted for inspiring their subordinates to achieve more than they originally thought themselves capable of (Bass, 1990; 1997; Jolson, Dubinsky, Yammarino, and Comer, 1993). Previous work has found that role stressors and enhancers influence the likelihood of service staff employing compulsory and discretionary prosocial service behaviors (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Ahearne, 1998; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990). The relationship posited between role stressors and enhancers, and service staff prosocial behaviors should be

\(^1\) In their original hypotheses the authors proposed that transformational leadership would have a greater effect upon employees’ work outcomes (e.g., role conflict, job satisfaction) than transactional leadership.
positively influenced by the employee receiving inspiration from a manager displaying transformational leadership. Transactional leadership, through its lack of focus upon employee development or inspiration, should have little, if any, effect upon this relationship. On the basis of this, the following is hypothesized:

**H3**: Leadership styles will moderate the relationship between front-line staff role stressors and enhancers, and front-line staff prosocial behaviors. Specifically, under transformational leadership, the relationship between front-line staff role stressors and enhancers and front-line staff prosocial behaviors will be stronger than under transactional leadership.

Leadership styles are also likely to moderate the relationship between managerial roles and employees' prosocial service behaviors. This reasoning is based upon a psychological phenomenon known as the “Pygmalion” effect (e.g., Sutton and Woodman, 1989), whereby supervisors, through their own expectations, are able to increase the performance of their subordinates. One of the characteristics of inspirationally motivating transformational leadership is the setting of high expectations of employees (Bass, 1997; Boehnke, DiStefano, DiStefano, and Bontis (1997). This setting of high expectations should strengthen the relationship between managerial roles and front-line staff prosocial service behaviors. According to Boehnke, DiStefano, DiStefano, and Bontis (1997) transformational leaders attempt to remove obstacles to employee prosocial behaviors.

Transactional leadership should also strengthen the relationship between managerial roles and service staff prosocial behaviors, although to a lesser extent than transformational leadership. Under transactional leadership there is a creation of behavioral expectation from employees as job tasks are identified and clarified (Bass and Avolio, 1990; 1993; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). However, the nature of a transactional leader in delivering task requirements (e.g., simply stating the task) is unlikely to have as great an effect as the delivery of a transformational leader (e.g., a charismatic, emotional appeal to the subordinate as per Bass, 1997; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995; Jolson, Dubinsky, Yammarino, and Comer, 1993). On the basis of the preceding argument the following hypothesis is presented:
Leadership styles will strengthen the relationship between managerial roles and front-line staff prosocial behaviors. Specifically, under transformational leadership, the relationship between managerial roles and front-line staff prosocial behaviors will be stronger than under transactional leadership.

In modern service industries, it is recognized that one of the major tasks of managers is to create a ‘climate for service’ by providing employees with guidelines to facilitate service delivery through adoption of a company vision (c.f., Dessler, 1999; Hartline and Ferrell, 1996; Schneider, White, and Paul, 1998). Transformational leaders seek to instil in their subordinates a sense of vision (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, and Koopman, 1997; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, and Spangler, 1995). In the context of services, it is likely that transformational service leaders will encourage employees to adopt a service vision. In contrast, under transactional leadership, employees have little identification with the organization, its mission, or its vision (Bass and Avolio, 1993).

Past research has indicated that employees do a better job when they believe their supervisors are transformational leaders (Bass and Avolio, 1993). A transformational service leader should attempt to instil in subordinates a desire to perform more effective prosocial behaviors, hence adopting the leader’s service vision. Recent evidence suggests a positive relationship between employees’ prosocial service behaviors and service performance (Webster and Sundaram, 1999). Under transformational leadership, front-line staff prosocial efforts should be exhibited with greater conviction than under conditions of transactional leadership; in the words of Russ, McNeilly, and Comer (1996, p. 4) transformational leaders “secure compliance through a shift in the beliefs, needs, and values of followers.” Hence:

Leadership styles will moderate the relationship between front-line staff prosocial behaviors and service performance. Specifically, under transformational leadership, the relationship between front-line staff prosocial behaviors and service performance will be stronger than under transactional leadership.

In terms of a general overview, although both transactional and transformational leadership styles are postulated to indirectly increase overall
service performance, the impact of transformational leadership is likely to be greater than that of its counterpart. The reasoning for this is that transformational leadership, as well as having direct effects, serves as a moderator upon many of the relationships proposed in Figure 1.

Figure 1. A conceptualization of service leadership and its effects.

Conclusions and Future Research
With the increased importance placed upon the management of marketing activities in a services context, it is critical to gain an understanding of the direct and indirect effects that leadership styles can have upon the quality of service provision.

The conceptualization presented builds upon existing leadership theory by applying the construct of leadership styles to a services context, providing relevance to both business and academic arenas. More specifically, the model has highlighted the importance of transformational and transactional leadership styles.

---

2 The dotted arrows in Figure 1 represent relationships discussed in the background section. These relationships are well established in the services marketing literature and as such are not considered core components of this particular study.
leadership styles in fostering increased service performance. This should be achieved through improving service managers’ as well as front-line employees’ service behaviors (c.f., Brief and Motowidlo, 1986; Spreng, Harrell, and Mackoy, 1995). Another managerial implication concerns hiring of new organizational members. Specifically, if certain leadership traits present themselves as being related to higher service performance standards, they could become useful criteria for selecting successful service managers.

The conceptual model also bridges a gap in the existing services marketing literature as it is, to the authors’ best knowledge, the first article to have drawn from the “leadership styles” literature to provide guidelines on enhancing service performance. Finally, the framework provides a platform for future research in the area of transformational and transactional service leadership.

Research is needed to test whether the conceptual model can be empirically validated. To this end, a triadic survey of service managers, front-line staff, and customers appears the most promising way forward. A qualitative approach could also be employed due to the relative infancy of this particular research topic. According to Churchill (1996), when little is known about a topic, exploratory research is warranted. In fact, the unique conditions of services marketing (e.g., close personal contact between front-line employees and customers) may require the leadership constructs to be altered in the course of their operationalization (in much the same way as leadership styles were originally adapted from the psychology literature to fit within the context of sales management as per Jolson, Dubinsky, Yammarino, and Comer, 1993). In this case, in-depth interviews with service managers and front-line staff could complement the literature in developing pools of items intended to capture transactional and transformational service leadership. Additional work could also seek to examine the effects of leadership styles based upon the dependency that the organization studied has upon services. For instance, a greater reliance upon products (i.e. less focus being placed upon customer service) may well result in a lesser need for service leadership within an organization.

As it now stands, the conceptual model of service leadership developed represents a definite step forward in the understanding of organizational service provision optimization and it seems worthwhile to devote attention, both academic and practitioner-oriented, towards continuing work in this much
under-researched area of the services marketing literature.
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