

Philipp HEINZL

Poznań University of Economics and Business

Doctoral Seminars in English

philipp\_heinzl@gmx.de

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2415-6128>

<https://doi.org/10.34739/dsd.2022.01.10>



---

## THE FULL RANGE LEADERSHIP MODEL IN ACTION: A CASE STUDY OF THE GERMAN AIRCRAFT PRODUCING COMPANY H3 GROB AIRCRAFT SE

---

**ABSTRACT:** Leadership is a fundamental part of a company's day-to-day operations and a critical factor in its success. This case study aims to demonstrate that a single manager can lead by actually using the full range of the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM). It also aims to provide an approach to the fact that the leadership style in turn influences the led manager's leadership style. To this end, a qualitative study was conducted using three in-depth interviews and several observations. The results indicate that a manager can implement all leadership styles of the Full Range Leadership Model in practice. It could also be observed that the leadership style of the manager led by the CEO is influenced by the CEO's own leadership style.

**KEYWORDS:** leadership, transformational, organization, Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM)

---

## MODEL PRZYWÓDZTWA PEŁNEGO ZASIĘGU W DZIAŁANIU: STU- DIUM PRZYPADKU NIEMIECKIEJ FIRMY H3 GROB AIRCRAFT SE

**ABSTRAKT:** Przywództwo jest podstawową częścią codziennej działalności firmy i kluczowym czynnikiem jej sukcesu. Niniejsze studium przypadku ma na celu wykazanie, że jeden menedżer może przewodzić, faktycznie korzystając z pełnego zakresu Modelu Przywództwa Pełnego Zasięgu (*Full Range Leadership Model* – FRLM). Ma również na celu przedstawienie podejścia do faktu, że styl przywództwa z kolei wpływa na styl przywództwa kierowanego menedżera. W tym celu przeprowadzono badanie jakościowe z wykorzystaniem trzech wywiadów pogłębionych i kilku obserwacji. Wyniki wskazują, że menedżer może wdrożyć w praktyce wszystkie style Modelu Przywództwa Pełnego Zasięgu oraz na to, że styl przywództwa menedżera kierowanego przez prezesa jest pod wpływem stylu przywództwa tego prezesa.

**SŁOWA KLUCZOWE:** przywództwo, transformacyjne, organizacyjne, Model Przywództwa Pełnego Zasięgu

## PREAMBLE

An external consultant, a new employee, or a young manager would probably wonder about the leadership style of the CEO of Grob Aircraft SE, Mr. André Rochus Hiebeler. He would look for a line, a clear leadership model, a leadership culture. The search would be in vain, because André Hiebeler does not lead his employees according to a textbook. He simply does not have a firmly anchored leadership style that could be grasped easily, that could be described with ease, that the HR department could coach towards. André Hiebeler is an autodidact<sup>1</sup>, acts and reacts in equal measure, is highly emotional and equally rational, recognises systems and human behaviour patterns and adapts his actions to them down to the last detail. These and other traits are reflected in his leadership style, which is thus of volatile stability, individually adapted to each single person and to each situation, and – as a final consequence – forces the organisation under his command to find its way in a constantly changing organism. This case study is intended as an introduction to an analysis of the Full Range Leadership Model<sup>2</sup>. It will discuss the effects of a varying leadership culture, in the form of a dominant individual, on differently – sometimes contrary – led managers. The essential advantages and potential risks of such an unconventional leadership culture shall be elaborated in approaches and give an impetus to question classical leadership styles in order to create and promote a lively form of employee leadership similar to Grob Aircraft SE. For future research, an approach should be provided as to whether there is a connection between how a manager is led and how he subsequently leads his own employees.

## INTRODUCTION

“Our employees are our greatest asset” – a phrase that almost every employee has probably heard or read in this or a similar form from his or her employer. However, the question arises as to what is hidden behind this phrase and what consequences the employer draws from this statement. What is the priority of dealing with employees and how high is the value of employee management? As trite as this opening quotation may seem, it is elementary for the general consideration of employee management and the relationship between manager and employee, because: For the operation of a modern organisation, the maintenance of its competitiveness and its strategically oriented, long-term existence, employee leadership is one of the most important and elementary instruments. Cascio confirms this assumption by describing employee leadership as a fundamental prerequisite for a company's long-term survival in a globalised, complex, and extremely volatile market.

---

<sup>1</sup> Vide A. Wittstock, *Autodidakten-Lexikon. Lebensskizzen derjenigen Personen aller Zeiten und Völker, welche auf außergewöhnlichem Bildungs- und Entwicklungsgänge sich zu einer hervorragenden Bedeutung in Kunst und Wissenschaft emporgearbeitet haben.*, A. Mentzel, Leipzig 1875.

<sup>2</sup> Vide B.J. Avolio, B.M. Bass, *Developing Potential across a Full Range of Leadership: Cases on Transactional and Transformational Leadership*, London 2001.

Leadership in general occurs in various economic and socio-economic contexts. Consciously or unconsciously, it is exercised by individuals of all kinds, in private as well as in professional contexts. The types of leadership are extensive and have been described in the literature with various models, approaches, and definitions. Due to the large amount of research on this and the constantly changing descriptions, there is no agreement on a universally valid definition of leadership and not on employee leadership in a business context as well. Rather, there are more than one hundred recognised definitions, which show various overlaps in content, but also have different perspectives<sup>3</sup>. Thanks to this extensive research in various disciplines, a relatively high level of research and description of ‘good’ leadership has been developed to date. A consensus in the literature is that leadership is influenced by social, historical, and economic factors and that these influences are also decisive in determining what kind of leader emerges<sup>4</sup>. This insight is of elementary importance for the present case study as it relates to an individual, Mr. André Hiebeler. It can also be assumed that the above-mentioned influencing factors also had a great impact on his leadership style. Details on this assumption can be found in the personality description of Mr. Hiebeler on the following pages. To simplify the understanding of leadership, this case study adopts the following definition: “Leadership is a power relationship between leaders and led whereby both can influence each other through mutual influence and close cooperation to achieve common goals”<sup>5</sup>.

The impact of leadership on the led is extensive and can only be briefly touched upon here. Regardless of the particular style, leadership has a direct impact on the employee’s attitude towards their supervisor and employer, as well as on their internal behaviour towards their co-workers and supervisors<sup>6</sup>. The general job satisfaction<sup>7</sup> and well-being<sup>8</sup> of the respective managed employee are directly affected by the manager’s leadership behaviour. Furthermore, one of the most essential effects of leadership style is that the motivation<sup>9</sup> and perfor-

---

<sup>3</sup> M.W. Dickson, et al., *Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: making progress, and raising new questions*, “The Leadership Quarterly” 14(6), 2003, pp. 729-768; J.C. Rost, *Leadership for the twenty-first century*, Santa Barbara: Greenwood Publishing Group 1993.

<sup>4</sup> B.M. Bass, *From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision*, in R.P. Vecchio. (ed.) *Leadership: understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organisations*, Notre Dame 1997, pp. 319-350.

<sup>5</sup> F.A. Fiedler, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, New York 1967; J.M. Burns, *Leadership*, New York 1978.

<sup>6</sup> B.J. Avolio, et al., *Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors*, “The Leadership Quarterly” 15, 2004, pp. 801–823; D. Effelsberg, *Transformational leadership and follower’s unethical behavior for the benefit of the company: A two-study investigation*, ‘Journal of Business Ethics’ 120, 2013, pp. 81–93.

<sup>7</sup> G. Blickle, *Leader behaviors as mediators of the leader characteristics – follower satisfaction relationship*, “Group & Organization Management” 38, 2013, pp. 601–628; E.K. Kelloway, et al., *Positive leadership and employee well-being*, “Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies” 20, 2013, pp. 107–117.

<sup>8</sup> B.A. Scott, et al., *A daily investigation of the role of manager empathy on employee well-being*, “Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes” 113, 2010, pp. 127–140; D. Stocker, et al., *Appreciative leadership and employee well-being in everyday working life*, “German Journal of Human Resource Management” 28, 2014, pp. 73–95.

<sup>9</sup> J.E. Bono, T.A. Judge, *Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders*, “Academy of Management Journal” 46, 2003, pp. 554–571; G.A. van Kleef, et al., *Searing sentiment or cold calculation? The effects of leader emotional displays on team performance depend on follower epistemic motivation*, “Academy of Management Journal” 52, 2009, pp. 562–580.

mance<sup>10</sup> of the individual employee are subject to direct effects in a positive or negative sense. Equally crucial is the influence of leadership on the creativity of employees<sup>11</sup>. Empowerment, a significant and much noted pillar of leadership outcomes, is also dependent on the particular leadership style<sup>12</sup>. Koappala et al.<sup>13</sup> and Rivkin et al.<sup>14</sup> have shown that the physical and mental health of the employee also depends on the type of leadership. It is also worth mentioning that the proactive assumption of responsibility at the employee level, as well as individual commitment to the activity, is dependent on the manager's leadership style<sup>15</sup>.

In the Engagement Index according to Nink, which refers to the Gallup study conducted throughout Germany, a clear picture of workplace quality and the resulting importance of employee leadership can be concluded<sup>16</sup>. On the one hand, the emotional attachment of employees to their jobs has been at a consistently low level for more than thirteen years. Only one in six employees attests to a high level of attachment to their employer. All other respondents are clearly below this level with low to no loyalty. This is not least due to poor leadership qualities. Nink concludes that work itself is perceived in Germany as a place of frustration rather than fulfillment. According to the findings of this study, employees generally lack little measurable, rather soft factors, such as appreciation by their direct supervisor and a lack of development opportunities within the company. The resulting lack of initiative and willingness to perform, as well as the increased rate of sick leave, disinterest, and employee turnover, cause German companies' annual losses in the double-digit billions. According to Wolf, successful employee management is an essential element in averting this damage to companies<sup>17</sup>.

## RESEARCH PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESIS

While the classical and modern literature focuses on the relationship between manager and employee, this case study will focus on the manager's claim to leadership vis-à-vis the company owner. The practical influence of the owner, at the top of the company management,

---

<sup>10</sup> V.A. Visser, et al., *How leader displays of happiness and sadness influence follower performance: Emotional contagion and creative versus analytical performance*, "The Leadership Quarterly" 24,2013, pp. 172–188.

<sup>11</sup> S.A. Eisenbeiß, S. Boerner, *A double-edged sword: Transformational leadership and individual creativity*, "British Journal of Management" 24, 2013, pp. 54–68; T.M. Amabile, et al., *Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support*, "The Leadership Quarterly" 15, 2004, pp. 5–32.

<sup>12</sup> R. Kark, et al., *The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency*, "Journal of Applied Psychology" 88, 2003, pp. 246–255.

<sup>13</sup> J. Kuoppala, *Leadership, job well-being, and health effects – a systematic review and a meta-analysis*, "J Occup Environ Med" 50(8) 2008, pp. 904–915.

<sup>14</sup> W. Rivkin, et al., *The positive relationship between servant leadership and employees' psychological health: a multi-method approach*, "Z Pers" 28(1–2) 2014, pp. 52–7.

<sup>15</sup> P. Schilpzand, *Not too tired to be proactive: Daily empowering leadership spurs next-morning employee proactivity as moderated by nightly sleep quality*, "Academy of Management Journal" 61,2018, pp. 2367–2387; M. Tims, et al., *Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement?*, "The Leadership Quarterly" 22, 2011, pp. 121–131.

<sup>16</sup> Vide M. Nink, *Engagement Index: Die neuesten Daten und Erkenntnisse aus 13 Jahren Gallup-Studie*, Redline Verlag, Münchner Verlagsgruppe GmbH, München 2014.

<sup>17</sup> Vide G. Wolf, *Mitarbeiterbindung – Strategie und Umsetzung im Unternehmen*, 4. Auflage, Haufe-Lexware, Freiburg 2020.

on his managers can also be considered as a manager-employee relationship<sup>18</sup>. However, the assumption is made here that the owner's influences on his superiors, his leadership style, have essential effects on their behaviour and thus on their respective employees. It is assumed that the own leadership style of the second and third level managers is essentially influenced by the leadership of the head of the company.

On the one hand, the present qualitative research work is intended to provide general insight into the effects of the leadership relationship. On the other hand, however, it is also intended to determine the factors on which the lived leadership style depends. To this end, the following hypotheses will be formulated and examined in a broader context:

*H1: It is assumed that the owner leads on the basis of the three general leadership categories, according to the FRLM. In other words, according to the entire spectrum of the FRLM.*

*H1a: It is assumed that the owner adjusts his management style based on the following personal characteristics of the manager reporting to him:*

- *Level of professional maturity of the manager*

*H1b: It is assumed that the owner adapts his leadership style based on the following personal characteristics:*

- *Own professional knowledge of the led manager and his field*

*H1c: It is assumed that the owner adjusts his management style based on the following business conditions:*

- *Current relevance of the managed department for the success of the company*

*H2: It is assumed that the "laissez-faire" leadership style has fewer negative effects than has been demonstrated in the current literature.*

The present case study is intended to provide the basis for dealing with this phenomenon, using the example of the company Grob Aircraft and its owner, chairman of the board and CEO, André Hiebeler, to create the basis for further studies. The fundamental differences between the management styles applied by Hiebeler and their general effects will be examined on practical examples. Three managers, direct reports of Hiebeler, who are led by him using three different leadership styles of the Full Range Leadership Model, according to Bass and Avolio, will be examined<sup>19</sup>. Based on these three leadership styles, the entire spectrum of

---

<sup>18</sup> Vide W. Zimmermann, *Unternehmer sind Verrückte – Wie Unternehmer Grenzen überwinden und was Manager von Ihnen lernen können*, Wiesbaden 2012.

<sup>19</sup> Vide B.J. Avolio, B.M. Bass, *The full range of leadership development programs: Basic and advanced manuals*, Binghampton 1991.



the basic leadership styles of the Full Range Leadership Model will be covered. The history and portfolio of the company under study, Grob Aircraft, will be briefly described. In addition, a short insight into the career and personality of André Hiebeler will be given in order to gain a better understanding of the person behind the situational leadership styles<sup>20</sup>.

## FULL RANGE LEADERSHIP MODEL

The Full Range Leadership Model, which forms the theoretical basis of this case study, was developed by the leadership research of the late 1970s. This model comprises three overarching leadership building blocks and divides them into two levels each, the level of activity and the level of effectiveness<sup>21</sup>. Transformational and transactional leadership form the focus of the leadership styles examined. The laissez-faire leadership style represents the third style.

Transformational leaders lead their employees on the basis of visions and guiding principles, which they themselves exemplify on the one hand and communicate on the other. In this way, they themselves become role models. This leadership style is characterised by a pioneering spirit in leadership and empowerment of the individual employees in the joint achievement of goals. The transformational leader changes the values, convictions, and hopes of his team members, and thus creates a higher level of maturity of the entire team. The egoistic ideas of the employees are replaced by higher ideals and goals. A value-creating process emerges. Through the manager's influence on the employee's self-concept, the so-called transformation occurs. The employee develops a better self-perception, and thus greater self-confidence and a greater willingness to work. This has a positive effect on the effectiveness of the entire team, higher motivation, and increased loyalty. Reduced fluctuation and higher profitability of the entire company are resulting as well<sup>22</sup>.

Bass differentiates between four characterising behaviours that distinguish transformational leadership<sup>23</sup>. 'Idealised influence' describes the moral and professional role model function, resulting in trust and respect. 'Inspirational motivation' describes the leader's enthusiasm, which awakens vision and confidence in those being led. The 'intellectual stimulation' describes that the leader awakens innovative thinking, critical action, and the courage to seek new ways. The fourth level, 'individualised consideration', describes the leader as a coach to recognise the needs of the employees and then to promote them.

A critical aspect of transformational leadership that should not be underestimated – also in connection with the present case study – is the risk of abuse of power. Bass, for example, de-

---

<sup>20</sup> Despite identical diction, a clear distinction should be drawn here from Fiedler's (1967) situational leadership theory.

<sup>21</sup> *Vide* B.J. Avolio, B.M. Bass, *Developing Potential...*, *op. cit.*

<sup>22</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>23</sup> *Vide* B.M. Bass, *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*, New York 1985.

scribes for the first time the potential negative handling of seemingly transformational leadership, with the aim of manipulating the led employees and achieving egoistic leadership goals<sup>24</sup>.

In the broader context of this thesis, the transformational leadership style is a fundamental building block in the relationship between the Grob Aircraft owner, André Hiebeler, and his subordinate managers.

Transactional leaders base their leadership relationship on a pure exchange relationship between themselves and the employee they lead. Clear agreements on objectives are created to clearly regulate the professional expectations of the employee and what is expected in return for the achievement of these objectives. This formulated set of rules, in the sense of maintaining the status quo, disregards the individual needs of the respective employee<sup>25</sup>. The smooth running of standardised processes in terms of compliance with quality standards, i.e. the focus on the ‘how’ rather than the ‘what’, is the main aim of transactional managers.

Unlike transformational leadership, characteristics such as enthusiasm, admiration, or empathy towards the leader are not the focus. Transactional leaders rather put the leadership focus on emotion-free agreement of clear structures. Due to a simple and benefit-oriented exchange, this leadership style focuses mainly on extrinsic motivational factors. This leadership style is relatively widespread and, according to current research results, satisfactory, goal-oriented, and effective for employees and managers. However, the positive effects, especially with regard to the motivation and loyalty of the leader, are less pronounced than with the transformational leadership style<sup>26</sup>. Bass describes the difference between the two leadership styles metaphorically as follows: “The transformational leader emphasizes what you can do for your country, the transactional leader on what your country can do for you.”<sup>27</sup>

The transactional leadership style is used very frequently in the relationship between André Hiebeler and his managers in the company studied, Grob Aircraft, occasionally in its pure form, but mostly in mixed form with transformational leadership elements.

A special feature of the transactional leadership style should also be listed here: passive-avoiding leadership or also laissez-faire leadership. The transactional leadership style is divided into various subcategories, which will not be explained in detail here, with the exception of ‘management-by-exception passive’. This leadership style, in contrast to the previously described ‘management-by-exception active’, has the special feature that in this leadership behaviour the leader completely keeps out of the leadership and the necessary decision-making processes. In this avoidant leadership style, the manager only intervenes – i.e. only takes on the leadership

---

<sup>24</sup> Vide B.M. Bass, *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers 1998.

<sup>25</sup> Vide E. Kirchler, *Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*, 3. Auflage, facultas WUV – UTB, Stuttgart 2014.

<sup>26</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>27</sup> B.M. Bass, *Leadership and performance...*, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

role – when difficulties or deviations have already occurred, at the earliest shortly before they occur. The manager is more of an observer than a controlling leader<sup>28</sup>.

This category of transactional leadership style is explicitly mentioned here because it could be observed in Mr. Hiebeler's everyday leadership. Since this leadership style occurs relatively frequently at Grob Aircraft, a separate sub-chapter will be dedicated to it in the further context. It is assumed at this point that the researched negative effects of this leadership style are less pronounced under Mr. Hiebeler. It is assumed that passive-avoiding-leadership, in the case of an intensive loyalty relationship between CEO and manager, is not perceived negatively, at least subjectively, by these two parties.

## ORGANISATIONAL CONTEXT AND SAMPLE

André Rochus Hiebeler was born on 8 April 1960 in Munich, where he now lives with his live-in partner. He has two children: Julia is a student in the Netherlands, Anton is a pupil at a Swiss private school. Hiebeler grew up in Munich with his mother, a housewife and source of peace for the family, and his father, Anton 'Toni' Hiebeler, a mountaineer, publicist and photographer, as well as his two older siblings Antoinette and Mathias. Hiebeler's childhood was marked by his father's constant existential struggle, and the resulting psychological pressure. Especially in his youth, the three siblings were largely left to their own in everyday life and in coping with all the tasks of life. According to Hiebeler's statement, it was this time of 'making it on their own' that shaped the three siblings into warriors by nature and provided the basis for each of them to become very successful professionally.

Hiebeler has no school-leaving qualifications, but completed an apprenticeship as a retail salesman in a sports goods shop. He got involved with flying at a young age and was a regular skydiver and paraglider. At the age of 30, he passed his exam for his pilot's licence and has since flown on countless aircraft types of all kinds.

He spent his first professional years as a skipper on various racing yachts. He then began his career as a founder. His entrepreneurial activities range from discotheque construction, equipment sales, real estate restoration and trading, to flight contracts and intensive civil and military aircraft sales. In 2009, Hiebeler, together with the H3 Aerospace Group, took over Grob Aircraft out of insolvency and still leads the company as CEO.

“Our Mission is to develop, manufacture, sell and support industry-leading aircraft, through the use of advanced technology, an innovative and flexible corporate culture, and the highest possible quality standards.” – André Hiebeler, CEO

---

<sup>28</sup> B.M. Bass, *Leadership and performance...*, *op. cit.*; J.M. Howell, B.J. Avolio, *Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance*, “*Journal of Applied Psychology*” 78(6), 1993, pp. 891–902.



Grob Aircraft SE is a German aircraft manufacturer in which planning, design and production take place at one location, in Tussenhausen-Mattsies, Germany. In 1971, Burkhard Grob founded the company Burkhard Grob Luft- und Raumfahrt GmbH & Co KG, which at that time was still part of the Grob-Werke in Mindelheim. In the early days, Grob mainly built plastic gliders. In 1976, Grob built the aircraft factory at the Mindelheim-Mattsies airfield and in the following years produced at a rate of 1.5 aircraft per day. At the beginning of the 1980s, the company became increasingly involved in the development and construction of engine-powered aircraft.

After an insolvency in 2008, Grob was taken over by the company H3 Aerospace and continued under the name Grob Aircraft AG. The product range was limited to the four production aircraft models G 115, G 120, G 120TP and G 520. The most recent model is the G 120TP-A, a training aircraft largely made of fibre composites and used for training purposes mainly in the military sector.

In mid-2017, Grob Aircraft AG was converted into an SE to ensure a better starting point for international negotiations. At this point, the company employs around 280 people at the Mattsies site, where the aircraft continue to be developed, manufactured and tested. In the almost 50 years of the company's history, Grob Aircraft has delivered a total of over 3500 aircraft, which have flown a combined total of over 7 million hours on 5 continents.

According to his own statement, Hiebeler has been broke several times in his life and has been a millionaire several times. Hiebeler draws his stamina and the strength to lead himself and also his company through difficult times from constant positive thinking, great composure in the face of difficult situations and an inexhaustible inner source of hope and knowledge of better times.

## RESEARCH METHODS

Despite the extensive research on the Full Range Leadership Model, its individual leadership styles and their impact on the employees being led, there is only superficial research on the impact on led employees who are themselves leaders<sup>29</sup>. Future research that can build on this case study will look at these same leaders and how the leadership style they are getting led by impacts their own leadership style towards their subordinates.

For the study of the leadership relationship between CEO and managers of Grob Aircraft, a qualitative case study methodology was chosen. Data was collected through individual interviews and observations.

The interviews were conducted with the CEO himself and three managers reporting to him. The managers interviewed were selected because, based on the experience of the Human Resources Department, their leadership styles cover the entire spectrum of the Full Range Leadership Model. The managers were selected irrespective of their department or length of

---

<sup>29</sup> *Vide W. Zimmermann, op. cit.*

service. One manager is from the administrative area, the second from the project business, the third from the production support area.

The interviews were semi-structured following an interview-guide based on the following themes: personal relationship with the CEO, professional relationship with the CEO, own assessment of the scope of responsibility, assessment of the leadership relationship with the CEO, criticisms/requests for improvement of this leadership relationship. The CEO himself was asked about his leadership responsibilities towards the respective managers, his general assessment of the personal/professional relationship, personal and professional criticism of the manager's leadership performance.

The observations were conducted during seven individual meetings between the CEO, HR and the manager and six further group meetings between the CEO, HR and various managers. An observational guide inspired by Schein<sup>30</sup> was used to obtain data on the leadership relationship between Mr. Hiebeler and the respective manager. In addition, several observations were made during informal conversations between HR and managers, during break times, and in general meetings with managers and the CEO. During the latter observations, field notes were taken, which were subsequently written down digitally.

The complete data collection was done directly by the author. The interviews were recorded in writing in digital form. Subsequent data analysis was conducted and interpreted using hermeneutic principles with the aim of fully understanding the context-based meaning of the statement made<sup>31</sup>. All results were read and interpreted multiple times. These were then sorted by theme and validated based on consistency between the different data sources.

## RESULTS

Based on the results from the interviews and the findings of the observations, it can be concluded that Hiebeler displays different leadership styles. From the complete absence of leadership to the most intense form, transformational leadership, a wide range of all styles in between, according to the Full Range Leadership Model, were observed. Hiebeler himself describes his leadership styles as individually adapted to the respective person and situation. When asked to explain this necessity of differentiated leadership in more detail, he replied that one person wants to be led with respect and recognition, another person wants to be led by providing structure, and the next person needs intensive support and empowerment.

Despite all the individuality of Hiebeler's leadership styles, they can be summarised in the following categories:

1. At the beginning, new managers are almost exclusively led transactionally.
2. In the case of technical mistakes, the leadership style changes to a more detailed transactional and/or transformational one.

---

<sup>30</sup> Vide E. Schein, *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, 3rd ed., San-Francisco 2004.

<sup>31</sup> Vide H.G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2nd ed., New York 2003.

3. A loss of loyalty or trust on the part of the manager towards Hiebeler leads to laissez-faire leadership, in the worst case to dismissal.
4. When the leader is positively and proactively involved in the strategic day-to-day business, a temporary change to transformational leadership elements could be observed.
5. Special features and temporary changes in leadership style occur in the case of current importance of the respective area for the corporate strategy or personal preferences for the current topics of an area. The leadership style towards managers working in areas close to Hiebelers' expertise is exceptional - these are often bypassed in day-to-day business.

Based on the observations, it could be determined that Hiebeler generally gives new managers – irrespective of their personality, aptitude for leadership or professional competence – initially a great deal of trust and autonomy and only rough goals and professional directional instructions. Thus, at the beginning of a new manager's career, he manages according to transactional leadership guidelines. This leadership style is initially maintained until the first incident of a positive or negative nature. If a professional and essential mistake is made by the manager in the initial period, the transactional leadership elements are reinforced and supplemented with transformational elements: goals are formulated more clearly, development discussions take place more frequently, the manager experiences empowerment and is given everything he or she needs to develop. Lessons are learned from the mistake that was made and everything is done to ensure that this or a similar mistake does not happen again.

The situation is different, however, if the mistake made by the manager at the beginning is accompanied by an abuse of trust or a lack of loyalty towards Hiebeler. In this case, Hiebeler's reaction is clearly more emotional and two potential strands of results emerge, depending on the severity of the abuse of loyalty: First, the manager is relieved of his position or alternatively removed from the company. Secondly, the leader is given the chance to make amends, but from this point onwards is critically observed in every activity they undertake, in the leadership role. This results in a leadership relationship similar to active laissez-faire leadership or management-by-exception, including regular review of decisions with loyalty. This is in line with the assumptions of Zimmermann, who describes loyalty in owner-managed companies as one of the highest goods.<sup>32</sup> The issue of loyalty is not considered in more detail in the further context, but should not go unmentioned due to its high importance.

A manager who, after an undefined period of time in his leadership role, becomes involved in the day-to-day management in a positive way, sets constructive incentives and thereby makes profitable contributions to the CEO and the company's success, also experiences a change in leadership style by Hiebeler. Regardless of the previous leadership style by Hiebeler, it then changes to a strong transformational style. The manager is promoted, developed, shown a career plan, goals are softly formulated and the manager is given great trust and empowerment on the way to achieving the goals, of influence those goals. Depending on

---

<sup>32</sup> *Vide W. Zimmermann, op. cit.*

the development of the leader – positive or negative – a kind of regression to the former transactional or laissez-faire leadership style could often be observed.

In addition to these classic and frequently observed leadership categories, a few special features of a few departments, in the leadership relationship between manager and CEO, could be identified.

Managers of departments that are currently of high importance for corporate strategy or growth/maintenance often experience a temporary change to transformational or transactional leadership by Hiebeler, regardless of his usual leadership style. The reason for this is Hiebeler's expectation of increasing the current success of the department through the adapted leadership style.

Similar observations could be made in departments that, in Hiebeler's individual view, have a temporarily more important role for personal or professional goals. In these, a constant change of the respective leadership style can be observed along the entire Full Range Leadership Model.

The management relationship in departments that are managed very closely by Hiebeler personally due to his own professional skills are quite special. Here it could be observed that the manager of the respective department is led by Hiebeler like an employee of the respective department and professional orders are often directly assigned to the individual employees. In this case, Hiebeler leads the entire team, bypassing the manager who is actually responsible. However, this particularity will be disregarded in the further consideration of this research work.

Hiebeler has 21 direct reports, who in turn have leadership responsibilities themselves. Apart from the occasional changes in leadership style, he leads them in roughly equal parts according to transformational and transactional styles. Nine of his managers are led according to each of these styles, the remaining three are subject to the subcategory of laissez-faire leadership.

These individual observations of Hiebeler on the various leadership styles in different situations and on different leaders can be seen as a basic explanation of understanding for the following deeper discussion.

## **TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

About half of the managers led by Mr. Hiebeler are led according to transformational leadership styles or with mainly existing leadership elements of this style. There is no universally valid leadership style for every transformational leader. For each of his managers, he applies different elements that are compiled from different styles. Transformational managers include all those who are led by Mr. Hiebeler, for the most part from elements of this category.

The interviewed manager, who was interviewed as a classic example of this style, is herself still very young in her leadership role. She is in her mid-20s and was promoted to the leadership role through a large-scale project she conducted, which has since been transferred and established as a separate business unit. She has been employed at Grob Aircraft for about five years, went through a three-year apprenticeship and worked as a clerk until her promotion. She currently has two employees reporting to her.

In her role as a manager led by Mr. Hiebeler, she has a distanced professional superior relationship. She is on a one-to-one basis with him, but is intensively coached by Mr. Hiebeler not only professionally but also personally. There are no regular appointments, but there are about three weekly meetings for professional and personal exchange. These meetings always take place when there is something urgent to discuss, when they arise from the situation, when positive or negative things have happened, or when they are actively requested by the staff member. A large part of the necessary daily communication also takes place via instant messenger. Because of the employee's frequent questions on professional topics, which do not always justify a personal disturbance, but must be answered urgently, the staff member chooses this messenger for communication. The employee has nothing to criticise about the frequency and type of communication and would not want to change anything.

When asked whether she thought Mr. Hiebeler put enough leadership work into her, the employee answered with a clear yes. In her opinion, there are currently no requests for change regarding the intensity of the cooperation with Mr. Hiebeler. The employee gets set professional and personal goals that are adjusted at irregular intervals. The decisive factor for this is the experience gained from the past time between the target meetings. Usually, she is given very clear prospect on what goal to achieve, which she is supposed to achieve in her own way, without any clear instructions but full empowerment for her approach. According to the employee, there is a trial-and-error agreement, on the basis of which she is assessed at the end of the goal achievement and is hence coached by Mr. Hiebeler on how things could have gone differently, worse or better. Here is an example observed by the author in which the trial-and-error outcome was Positive:

Mr. Hiebeler instructed the employee to keep her department working during the period of company leave (100% absence of all company employees). The employee then returned to her office and, based on experience working with Mr. Hiebeler, worked out a management decision-making presentation. Its containment showed that causing work to continue during company leave had a negative cost-benefit factor. For the elaboration, the employee consulted senior managers from other departments. After presenting the draft to Mr. Hiebeler, the employee received high praise for her excellent approach. She was encouraged to continue thinking in this way and to continue to contribute from the company's perspective.

In general, the employee considers this trial-and-error agreement to be very positive and profitable for her experience increase and her personal and professional development. Nevertheless, she has a subliminal fear of failing Mr. Hiebeler, of not meeting his expectations and of not being able to keep up with the expected development demands. This concern is mitigated by the open culture of error with Mr. Hiebeler, in which personal fears are also addressed, reasons for them are identified and solutions are hence worked out. The employee evaluates Mr. Hiebeler's openness and brutal honesty as extremely beneficial and as a necessary basis for further personal and professional development. The employee did not always

mention the quality of Mr. Hiebeler's answers to her professional questions in a positive light. Occasionally, she feels that she is not sufficiently well advised by Mr. Hiebeler, which is due to her inexperience on the one hand and Mr. Hiebeler's lack of in-depth knowledge of the specialist topics in the area on the other. In order to compensate for this, Mr. Hiebeler provides the employee with various mentors who support her in an advisory capacity.

Overall, the employee assesses her management relationship with Mr. Hiebeler as absolutely positive, without any requests for change. The professional closeness and personal development with Mr. Hiebeler is exceptionally appreciative, the feedback culture could hardly be better, there is simply nothing to criticise.

The employee cannot answer whether her leadership relationship with Mr. Hiebeler currently influences her own leadership behaviour, but she is certain that it will be strongly influenced by it in the near and distant future. This assumption can be confirmed to some extent through observations. Due to the fact that the employee did not take on the leadership role long ago, few conclusions can be drawn about the influences of the owner on the employee's leadership activities.

From the author's point of view, the comments of the employee can only be confirmed. Strong empowerment of the young manager in all professional and personal matters, an open, critical and constructive error culture and the individual opportunity for development make this transformational leadership relationship an added value for the company.

## **TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP**

The second half of the employees managed by Mr. Hiebeler he leads according to transactional leadership styles or elements. One of the more passive subcategories of the transactional leadership style, *laissez-faire*, is used by a small part of the managers. This is therefore considered in a separate sub-chapter.

The manager, who is managed according to a transactional management style, is currently on the verge of retirement. He has spent almost his entire working life at Grob Aircraft or its predecessor companies. He has been in the management role for many years and the entire time since Mr. Hiebeler took over the company in 2009. Currently, four employees report to him.

Due to all the years of working together and the high level of loyalty (statement of both parties independently of each other and result of observations), there is a close and trusting management relationship between each other, which is based above all on respect, appreciation and respect for each other. Also due to the high degree of autonomy in management that Mr. Hiebeler grants him for his area, there are hardly any professional or personal regular appointments for development and/or professional questions. Spontaneous meetings are only called in case of acute need, queries or general adjustments in direction. These take place about one to four times a month. Neither Mr. Hiebeler nor the staff member have anything to criticise about this kind of cooperation or wish for adjustments in any direction.



The question of whether Mr Hiebeler's management work is of sufficient scope and quality was answered by the employee with a clear yes. Neither professionally nor personally does Mr. Hiebeler intervene in the day-to-day business in an elementary way and places great trust in the decisions of the employee and his departmental work. Operational issues are rarely discussed; clear guidelines apply and are adhered to. When it comes to strategic issues, however, there is a special phenomenon in the management relationship between the two: On the one hand the rough direction is given on rare occasions by the owner, on the other hand it is discussed at eye level. Mr. Hiebeler often lets me advise him and only then makes a decision that affects my department, according to the employee. According to Mr. Hiebeler's statement, it is in his interest to maintain the so-called status quo for the area of this managed employee: Everything has been going the right way for years, so why should I want changes when everything fits? The employee feels that this is the result of his constant performance in the department. This has also led to the fact that the employee hardly ever seeks reassurance from Mr. Hiebeler on technical issues – he takes all risks on his own.

Only rough but clear professional and personal goals are set for the employee, which is seen as positive by both sides. Both parties interpret this as appreciative of the employee's constant performance. Due to very clear agreements and a fixed scope of tasks, there is no fear of professional or personal failure either on the part of the employee or on the part of Mr. Hiebeler towards the employee and his department. Both assess the error culture as hardly existent; after all, there is no reason to question a well-functioning system. According to the employee, there has never been any trouble in all the years of working together. According to this, exchanges about mistakes and improvements only take place very rarely, although somewhat more frequently in the early days of the cooperation. The employee was only critical of the occasionally slow communication chain between him and the owner.

In general, the joint management relationship is rated as very good by both sides. Because a clear framework of responsibility and cooperation was established many years ago and has never been subject to change, there are clear rules that can be observed and lead to this satisfaction. The employee answered with a clear no as to whether the management style had an influence on his own management style. Nothing to the contrary could be proven through observations.

The leadership relationship of the two has high proportions of the transactional leadership style. However, due to the fact that the two of them have practised the common set of rules so well over the years, the relationship has undergone a change. It has changed from a more classic transactional leadership relationship, management by objectives<sup>33</sup>, to another sub-category: a leadership relationship according to management by exception<sup>34</sup>. It is also interesting that the common leadership relationship could also contain small elements of oth-

---

<sup>33</sup> Vide F. Malik, *Führen, Leisten, Leben. Wirksames Management für eine neue Zeit*, München 2001.

<sup>34</sup> Vide C. Akdeniz, *Management by Exception Explained*, Band Vol. 7 2015.

er, undefined, leadership styles. This is indicated by the commentary on the mutual advisory activity in professional and personal matters.

From the point of view of the author and his observations, the management relationship of the two parties and the results from it can be described as benefit for the company. Regularly questioning and realigning the established professional framework could bring further benefits for the success of the department and its influence on the company's results.

## **LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP**

A sub-category of the transactional leadership style is the laissez-faire leadership<sup>35</sup>, which will receive its own chapter here. The reason for this is that, according to the field observations with three managers, this leadership style is also a fundamental part of the leadership culture at Grob Aircraft.

The laissez-faire manager under consideration here has been part of Grob Aircraft for five years. For just under a year, he has been in the management role with personnel responsibility for 15 employees. It is worth mentioning that his area has little direct influence on the company's success, as it is more concerned with maintenance and servicing activities.

According to the observations and the statements of both leadership parties, it could be determined that the leadership relationship between the two is poorly intensive. Although there is respectful interaction between the parties, there are almost no regular or irregular professional or personal discussions between them. During the employee's time as a manager, there was only one professional discussion, the content and significance of which was described by the employee as good. An intensification of the cooperation is only desired by the employee, but not planned by either party.

It was observed, that Mr. Hiebeler's laissez-faire leadership attitude in this case is not attributed to the person, but to the area. Based on past observations, it could be determined that the management predecessors in this area also only benefited from the laissez-faire management style. Interventions in the work of their predecessors only occurred when they made elementary mistakes and in order to compensate for them or to reduce the damage.

The employee currently affected clearly wishes for more leadership by Hiebeler. The result of this little present leadership is that the employee seeks advice and guidance from other managers, according to him he does not want to burden the boss with his questions. This is a remarkable phenomenon that has been observed several times and confirmed by all parties concerned. The employee concerned asks well-versed managers from various departments about elementary decisions, advice on professional or personal development and about all questions of employee management. Furthermore, it is astonishing that Hiebeler seems to give instructions to the employee. According to his statement, however, these are passed on to him via third parties. This phenomenon was also observed during the field observations. One of these

---

<sup>35</sup> Vide B.M. Bass, *Leadership and performance...*, *op. cit.*

third parties who takes over the communication is the transactional manager mentioned in the previous chapter. It was observed that Hiebeler's direct contact is bypassed for two reasons:

1. He lacks the time and possibly the detailed technical knowledge to distinguish which department is affected by his decisions.
2. The relationship of trust with the directly commissioned manager is significantly higher than with the executive manager.

It is also revealing that the employee can also find positive things in this almost non-existent management style. For example, he perceives the great freedom he has in carrying out his work as appreciative: If he has nothing to complain about, then everything I do seems to be good. In the observations, however, it was also noted that the employee has several strategic ideas in terms of saving money and increasing profitability of his department and hence the whole enterprise. However, due to the absence of management, these ideas do not find a forum to be heard. In addition, the employee attested to a certain fear of failing in the job, hoping not to disappoint the demands. This is also a characteristic of the lack of feedback. A culture of error does not exist.

The employee confirms several times that his own leadership style is strongly influenced by Hiebeler's leadership.

The observations confirm the opinion of the literature that the absence of leadership is the least positively assessable leadership style. However, it could also be observed that a *laissez-faire* culture – In certain areas and under certain conditions – can bring advantages for both sides. Whether this is due to the loyalty between manager and owner assumed at the beginning could not be proven at this point. The added value of this leadership style is, from the company's perspective and considering all observed aspects and in comparison to the two aforementioned leadership styles, rather low.

## DISCUSSION

The results presented in advance will now be discussed and listed again on the basis of the hypotheses mentioned at the beginning.

*H1: It is assumed that the owner leads on the basis of the three general leadership categories, according to the FRLM. In other words, according to the entire spectrum of the FRLM.*

An important finding of this case study is that Hiebeler demonstrably leads according to the entire spectrum of the Full Range Leadership Model. This is particularly evident from the results of the individual surveys representing the three basic styles. The initial results indicate that each of the leadership styles applied is perceived as relatively positive by all parties.

*H1a: It is assumed that the owner adjusts his management style based on the following personal characteristics, of the manager reporting to him:*

*Professional maturity level of the manager*

Based on the field observations, but also in particular on the selected employees interviewed in detail, it was clearly observed that the maturity level of the manager is evidently an influencing factor on the management style of the owner. While the younger, still inexperienced manager is led according to partly transformational but also transactional leadership elements, such as meticulous review of individual work steps, the situation is different for the very experienced manager. Due to their high level of experience, they are managed according to purely transactional management elements. The individual level of professional maturity of the manager therefore obviously has a direct influence on the management style of the owner.

*H1b: It is assumed that the owner adapts his leadership style based on the following personal characteristics:*

- *Own professional knowledge of the led manager and his field*

Based on the field observations in particular, it was possible to establish that the very specialist areas which the owner himself describes as his own area of knowledge are permanently under extremely close transactional management. It can also be observed that managers who are responsible for these areas are often bypassed and instructions/management take place directly with the subordinate employees. In the individual case of the presented owner, these are in particular all areas that have a direct connection with the area of sales.

*H1c: It is assumed that the owner adjusts his management style based on the following business conditions:*

- *Current relevance of the managed department for the success of the company*

In the case of the young manager in particular, it was observed that the current relevance of the topic for which this manager was responsible resulted in highly intensive transformational leadership work on the part of the owner. Based on the downstream field observation, it was again possible to determine that, due to the decreasing relevance of the area supervised, the leadership style increasingly ran in the direction of the transactional leadership elements.

*H2: It is assumed that the "laissez-faire" leadership style has fewer negative effects than has been demonstrated in current literature*

An interesting observed fact is that the laissez-faire leadership style was not perceived as negative by the manager interviewed. Rather, the manager's interpretation was that, due to the complete absence of leadership, he or she was obviously very highly trusted in the manager's work. This very subjective perception contrasts strongly with the assumption of the literature<sup>36</sup>, which assumes a high level of dissatisfaction with this leadership style.

## CONCLUSION

This case study, based on Grob Aircraft SE and its CEO, Mr. André Hiebeler, has explained how a single supervisor applies different leadership styles in practice and what effects these have in detail. It has been shown that motivation<sup>37</sup> and performance<sup>38</sup> depend on the leadership style of the supervisor. The strong influence of a transformational leadership culture on creativity and empowerment<sup>39</sup> suspected in the literature could also be confirmed. The results of this case study, in relation to the laissez-faire leadership style and the assumption in the literature that employee satisfaction is the lowest after this style<sup>40</sup>, can be confirmed as true for the most part, but not completely. Research showing that engagement within transactional and transformational managed employees<sup>41</sup> could also be confirmed. However, in this case study, the laissez-faire led manager cannot be shown to be less engaged than the others. Interestingly, the laissez-faire leadership style partially practised by Hiebeler, was not perceived as negatively, by the interviewed manager and during the field observations, as it is portrayed in the literature<sup>42</sup>.

Another important finding of this case study is that Hiebeler has been shown to lead according to the full spectrum of the Full Range Leadership Model. The initial results indicate that each of the applied leadership styles is perceived as relatively positive by all parties. The versatile leadership culture implemented by the CEO makes Grob Aircraft a relevant subject for further research. Future research could look more deeply into the influences on leadership style and behaviour of the respective managers. Especially since these were only partially assessed in the present case study, but due to the - only very superficial - results, the assumption arises that this influence does exist.

The conclusions should be drawn with caution because of the specific context and leadership structure of the company studied. Hiebeler has, as already mentioned, a special charac-

---

<sup>36</sup> Vide B.M. Bass, *Leadership and performance...*, *op. cit.*

<sup>37</sup> J.E. Bono, T.A. Judge, *Self-concordance at work...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 554–571; G.A. van Kleef, et al., *Searing...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 562–580.

<sup>38</sup> V.A. Visser, et al., *How leader displays...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 172–188.

<sup>39</sup> S.A. Eisenbeiß, S. Boerner, *A double-edged sword...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 54–68; T.M. Amabile, et al., *Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support*, "The Leadership Quarterly" 15, 2004, pp. 5–32; R. Kark, et al., *The two faces...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 246–255.

<sup>40</sup> Vide B.M. Bass, *Leadership and performance...*, *op. cit.*

<sup>41</sup> P. Schilpzand, et al., *Not too tired...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 2367–2387; M. Tims, et al., *Do transformational leaders...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 121–131.

<sup>42</sup> Vide P.G. Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and practice*, Los Angeles, CA 2016.

ter and an unusual career for a CEO. Due to these special circumstances, the results could deviate in relation to larger study groups.

There is a need for further research about how leaders adapt or change their actions towards their employees because of the leadership style they are subject to. This case study can be used as a basis for this research.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Akdeniz Can. 2015. *Management by Exception Explained*. Business School Books. Band Vol 7.
- Amabile Teresa, Schatzel Elizabeth, Moneta Giovanni, Kramer Steven. 2004. „Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support”. *The Leadership Quarterly* 15: 5–32.
- Avolio Bruce, Bass Bernard. 1991. *The full range of leadership development programs: Basic and advanced manuals*. Binghampton: Bass Avolio & Associates.
- Avolio Bruce, Bass Bernard. 2001. *Developing Potential across a Full Range of Leadership: Cases on Transactional and Transformational Leadership*. London: Psychology Press.
- Avolio Bruce, Gardner William, Walumbwa Fred, Luthans Fred, May Douglas. 2004. „Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors“. *The Leadership Quarterly* 15: 801–823.
- Bass Bernard. 1985. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass Bernard. 1997. *From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision*. In Vecchio, R. (ed.). „*Leadership: understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organisations*“. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press: 319-350.
- Bass Bernard. 1998. *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bass Bernard. 2002. *Cognitive, social, and emotional intelligence of transformational leaders*. In R. E. Riggio, S. E. Murphy, F. J. Pirozzolo (ed.). „*LEA's organization and management series. Multiple intelligences and leadership*“. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers: 105-118.
- Blickle Gerhard, Kane-Frieder Rachel, Oerder Katharina, Wihler Andreas, von Below Ariane, Schütte Nora, Matanovic Anja, Mudlagk Daniel, Kokudeva Tatyana, Ferris Gerald. 2013). „Leader behaviors as mediators of the leader characteristics – follower satisfaction relationship“. *Group & Organization Management* 38: 601–628.
- Bono Joyce, Judge Timothy. 2003. „Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders“. *Academy of Management Journal* 46: 554–571.
- Burns James MacGregor. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Cascio Wayne. 1995. *Guide to responsible structuring*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Labour.
- Dickson Marcus, Den Hartog Deanne, Mitchelson Jacqueline. 2003. „Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: making progress, and raising new questions“. *The Leadership Quarterly* 14(6): 729-768.



- Effelsberg David, Solga Marc, Gurt Jochen. 2013. Transformational leadership and follower's unethical behavior for the benefit of the company: A two-study investigation". *Journal of Business Ethics* 120: 81–93.
- Eisenbeiß Silke, Boerner Sabine. 2013. „A double-edged sword: Transformational leadership and individual creativity“. *British Journal of Management* 24: 54–68.
- Fiedler Fred. 1967. *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York.
- Fiedler Fred. 1981. *Leader attitudes and group effectiveness*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Gadamer Hans-Georg. 2003. *Truth and Method*. 2nd edition, New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Howell Jane, Avolio Bruce. 1993. „Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance“. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78(6): 891–902.
- Kark Ronit, Shamir Boas, Chen Gilad. 2003. „The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency“. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88: 246–255.
- Kelloway Kevin, Weigand Heidi, McKee Margaret, Das Hari. 2013. „Positive leadership and employee well-being“. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 20: 107–117.
- Kirchler Erich. 2014. *Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*. 3. Auflage, facultas WUV – UTB, Stuttgart.
- Kuoppala Jaana, Lamminpää Anne, Liira Juha, Vainio Harri. 2008. „Leadership, job well-being, and health effects – a systematic review and a meta-analysis“. *J Occup Environ Med* 50(8): 904–915.
- Malik Fredmund. 2001. *Führen, Leisten, Leben. Wirksames Management für eine neue Zeit*. Heyne Verlag, München.
- Nink Marco. 2014. *Engagement Index: Die neuesten Daten und Erkenntnisse aus 13 Jahren Gallup-Studie*. Redline Verlag, Münchner Verlagsgruppe GmbH, München.
- Northouse Peter. 2016. „Leadership: Theory and practice.“, Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Rivkin Wladislaw, Diestel Stefan, Schmidt Klaus-Helmut. 2014. „The positive relationship between servant leadership and employees' psychological health: a multi-method approach“. *Z Pers* 28(1–2): 52–72.
- Rost Joseph. 1993. *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Santa Barbara: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Schein Edgar. 2004. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 3rd edition, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Schilpzand Paulin, Houston Lawrence, Cho Jeewon. 2018. „Not too tired to be proactive: Daily empowering leadership spurs next-morning employee proactivity as moderated by nightly sleep quality“. *Academy of Management Journal* 61: 2367–2387.
- Scott Brent, Colquitt Jason, Paddock Layne, Judge Timothy. 2010. „A daily investigation of the role of manager empathy on employee well-being“. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 113: 127–140.

- Stocker Desiree, Jacobshagen Nicola, Krings Rabea, Pfister Isabel, Semmer Norbert. 2014. „Appreciative leadership and employee well-being in everyday working life.“ *German Journal of Human Resource Management* 28: 73–95.
- Tims Maria, Bakker Arnold, Xanthopoulou Despoina. 2011. „Do transformational leaders enhance their followers’ daily work engagement?“. *The Leadership Quarterly* 22: 121–131.
- Van Kleef Gerben, Homan Astrid, Beersma Bianca, Van Knippenberg Barbara, Van Knippenberg Daan, Damen Frederic. 2009. „Searing sentiment or cold calculation? The effects of leader emotional displays on team performance depend on follower epistemic motivation.“. *Academy of Management Journal* 52: 562–580.
- Visser Victoria, van Knippenberg Daan, Van Kleef Gerben, Wisse Barbara. 2013. „How leader displays of happiness and sadness influence follower performance: Emotional contagion and creative versus analytical performance.“. *The Leadership Quarterly* 24: 172–188.
- Wittstock Albert. 1875.: *Autodidakten-Lexikon. Lebensskizzen derjenigen Personen aller Zeiten und Völker, welche auf außergewöhnlichem Bildungs- und Entwicklungsgange sich zu einer hervorragenden Bedeutung in Kunst und Wissenschaft emporgearbeitet haben.* A. Mentzel, Leipzig.
- Wolf Gunther. 2020. *Mitarbeiterbindung – Strategie und Umsetzung im Unternehmen.* 4. Auflage, Haufe-Lexware, Freiburg.
- Zimmermann Wolfgang. 2012. *Unternehmer sind Verrückte – Wie Unternehmer Grenzen überwinden und was Manager von Ihnen lernen können.* Springer Gabler Verlag, Wiesbaden.