The influences of transformational leadership on employee employability: Evidence from China
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Introduction

Introduced by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985), transformational leadership has gained legitimacy over the last three decades and proved to be an effective and influential enabler in changing employees’ attitudes and behaviors, ultimately resulting in better performance of organizations (García-Morales et al., 2008; Katou, 2015; Para-González et al., 2018). While there is more of an exchange relationship in transactional leadership behavior with contingent rewards (Burns, 1978), the transformational type requires that the leader encourages employees to alter their attitudes, beliefs and values (Rafferty and Griffin, 2004). Transformational leadership is premised on provision of individualized support and enhancement of the intellectual capabilities of employees resulting in better task performance (Lowe et al., 1996; Judge and Piccolo, 2004) or overall improved efficacy of organizations (Avolio, 1999; Avolio et al., 1999; DeGroot et al., 2000; Dumdum et al., 2002; Boerner et al., 2007).

Empirical research in the field suggests that transformational leadership may also enhance employability (Camps and Rodríguez, 2011; Van der Heijden and Bakker, 2011; Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden, 2014) and well-being of employees (Nielsen et al., 2008). Following the general definition of employability – the ability to retain a job or apply for a new desired one (Forrier and Sels, 2003; Fugate et al., 2004; Rothwell and Arnold, 2007) – and in line with the more specific perceived (subjective) employability concept (Berntson et al., 2006; De Cuyper et al., 2011) we base our study on employees’ perceptions of their potential and capabilities, which are believed to be necessary to secure a new job and make the necessary labor market transitions.

A number of key researchers in the realm of employability (Berntson et al., 2006; De Cuyper et al., 2008; Van Emmerik et al., 2012) have pointed out the shift towards subjective or perceived employability due to a person-centred adaptation construct, which predisposes
individuals to change, proactively emphasizing the high degree of autonomy (Crant, 2000; Pruijt, 2013). The authors of this paper adhere to the assumption that in current conditions employees are more likely to adopt a course of action based upon their own perceptions rather than any objective reality as the dynamic nature of employability requires consideration of both contextual and individual factors such as willingness to change jobs, skills, physical and cognitive suitability and adaptability.

As employability is seen as advantageous to both employees and employers (Day, 2000; De Vries et al., 2001) by virtue of deteriorating job security, increased flexibility and greater individualization of employees (Berntson et al., 2006), the factors influencing employability require research attention. One of them is transformational leadership, the influence of which can potentially be observed on employees’ attitudes and behaviors resulting in better performance of organizations through higher productivity (Fugate et al., 2004) and improvement of the health and well-being of employees (Berntson and Marklund, 2007; De Cuyper et al., 2008).

There is a small body of empirical research focusing on the relationship between transformational leadership and self-perceived employability, along with the development of mediating models, hence our focus is underpinned by a number of reasons.

First, due to drastic changes in the policies of the Chinese government aimed at attracting foreign direct investment and encouraging the growth of the domestic private sector, the roles of company leaders become more significant (Newman and Butler, 2014). In this regard, a transformational leader by exertion of a greater influence on employees and through participation and involvement in both individual and team-focused tasks is able to challenge those employees intellectually and encourage creative thinking, thus ultimately enhancing their employability (Purvanova and Bono, 2009).

Our research has been developed to introduce several new elements of job characteristics
and social exchange theory to the studies of transformational leadership and employability. Thus, our second reason (linked to job characteristics theory) for choosing transformational leadership is that these leaders encourage motivated behavior, through which employees are required to use and be capable of using a variety of skills. A transformational leader ensures that tasks are clearly identified and can be accomplished from start to finish and are significant to a variety of stakeholders, with greater autonomy assigned to the employee and feedback being provided upon the completion of the task.

Third, besides job characteristics theory, transformational leadership is connected to social exchange theory (Wang et al., 2005), at the heart of which there is an interaction between two agents: individuals and organizations (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). We take into consideration three types of social exchange: perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange and team-member exchange.

For these reasons, the main aim of our paper is to examine the mediating role of job characteristics and social exchange in transformational leadership and employability relationships. The study also opens up a debate around the employability of employees as it stands apart from the performance measurement. We believe that this new mediating model can provide an insight into complex mechanisms of employability enhancement from the perspective of leader development.

**Theoretical background and hypotheses**

*Transformational leadership and employability*

Given the drastic transformations observed across countries and intensified by globalization processes and technological advancement (Beck, 2000; Zhiwen and Van der Heijden, 2008; Smith, 2010), the established parity on the job market has changed, pointing
to the lack of job security in the first instance for employees and ambiguity over where to invest time, financial resources and physical energy, while undergoing training, acquiring new skills or searching for jobs (De Grip et al., 2004).

As jobs became volatile, employees’ concerns accumulate in their abilities to offer marketable skills in order to secure a job and thus employability as a means to derive job security has been highlighted by numerous researchers in the field (Rothwell et al., 2008; Scholarios et al., 2008; Brown et al., 2010; Van Emmerik et al., 2012; Pruijt, 2013). Researchers appealed for the need to consider the mutual interest in investment into employability from the employer and employee sides, bringing about the ‘new psychological contract’ (Pruijt, 2013) between parties with continuous investment expected from the former and commitment from the latter. A significant proportion of employers are able to recognize the need for such investments leading to achievement of competitive advantage and thus contributing to the success of organizations (De Cuyper et al., 2011; Van den Broeck et al., 2014).

According to the transformational leadership stream of research, the norms and values of employees are transformed as a result of the behavior of the leader aiming for the amplification of followers’ performance, which eventually results in increased performance of the organization (Bass, 1985; Nielsen et al., 2008; Tims et al., 2011). The main aspect of transformational leadership is that through the facilitator (leader) it can convey an organization’s clear vision to followers, inspire and shape others with the provision of energy, passion, enthusiasm, and determination in the workplace (Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1989). Correspondingly, a transformational leader possesses a wide spectrum of attributes: friendly and supportive manner of acting, inspirational motivation, intellectual influence, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985).
Charismatic behavior is at the center of this concept and is performed through the diffusion of the emotional behavior of the employees into the broader visionary aspect (Rafferty and Griffin, 2004). Transformational leadership is seen to be in high demand at a time of austerity, when the organizational context is changing (Zhang et al., 2012) and there is a widespread view among researchers that this leadership style has impact on the bottom-line performance of an organization (Koene et al., 2002). Thus the effectiveness of the organization is enhanced as a result of changes in followers’ performance and individual effectiveness (Li and Hung, 2009; Zhang et al., 2012). Therefore the utilitarian behavior of employees can be observed as they are prepared by the transformational leader to act for the good of larger groupings, for instance teams or entire organizations revealing the collectivistic orientation of the leader (Dvir et al., 2002; Jung et al., 2009). Thus the fulfilment of the followers’ current needs are reoriented toward motivating them to perform beyond their contractual obligations by arousing dormant needs of the employees (Dvir et al., 2002; Miao et al., 2012)

One of the unique aspects of transformational leadership is the anxiety of the leader about followers’ development, with efforts made to evaluate their potential in order to match existing and future requirements (Dvir et al., 2002). This consequently requires continuous development of the employee as a result of the need to satisfy self-actualization criteria thus revealing their dormant needs (Bass, 1985; Dvir et al., 2002). In this regard the research on trust, work engagement and well-being is transfused into transformational leadership studies (Nielsen et al., 2008; Tims et al., 2011; Shih et al., 2012).

In the same vein, very few experts engaged with the research on employability and transformational leadership (Camps and Rodríguez, 2011; Van der Heijden and Bakker, 2011). Thus Camps and Rodriguez (2011) touched on the aspect of organizational learning culture as the mediating factor, appealing for continuous learning, and therefore competency
improvement. Here transformational leadership could trigger the need for learning and the results suggest that worker-perceived transformational leadership can both affect followers’ employability perception, and their actual employability. The requirement to enhance employability by the ‘continuous fulfilling, acquiring or creating of work through the optimal use of competences’ (Van der Heijde and Van der Heijden, 2006) can be met through the transformational leadership approach. In a similar vein, Van der Heijden and Bakker (2011) pointed out that transformational leadership has an indirect relationship with supervisor ratings of employability through work-related flow. In order to find out how empirical evidence fits the theoretical framework, we aim to explore the relationship between employees’ perceptions of their managers’ transformational leadership style and their self-perceived employability.

Therefore the following hypothesis is proposed:

**Hypothesis 1:** Employees’ perceptions of transformational leadership style inside the organization positively affect their self-perceived employability.

*The role of job characteristics*

The job characteristics approach introduced by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and job strain model developed by Karasek (1979) are based on the notion of separation of job demands and decision latitude. Job demand refers to the psychological factors involved in accomplishing the workload, unexpected tasks, and job-related personal conflicts, while job decision latitude refers to the extent of influence that employees can exert over their work routine. Influencing factors include opportunities to use various job-related skills (i.e. skill discretion) and the authority to make decisions over work (i.e. decision authority).

Van den Broeck et al. (2014) provided evidence that high job demand negatively influences employees’ job performance because employees may feel exhausted and worn out
in the face of high pressure coming from high job demands (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Schaufeli et al., 2009). However, if the job is accomplished, it may have a positive effect on employees (Van Emmerik et al., 2009).

The role of transformational leadership is important in developing positive feelings of accomplishment, resulting in better job performance. The leader not only provides the required resources and support, but also exerts pressure on followers in order to help them perform better. Leaders can use verbal persuasion emphasizing the organization’s mission as a means to guide their followers towards making better judgments about the work environment (Shamir et al., 1993). Transformational leaders are able to develop an understanding of job demands for employees, and to motivate their followers through job characteristics. Besides, employees would be motivated to acquire knowledge and skills necessary for the completion of the task, minimizing the stress. Therefore, the authors propose the hypothesis that appropriate job demands are helpful to employees’ employability. Skill discretion and decision authority could be considered as work-related resources, and they have been found to be positively associated with staff dedication and work engagement (Van den Broeck et al., 2010). Moreover, employees may benefit from job resources even when working under demanding conditions (Van den Broeck et al., 2011). This is because job resources may buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. A significant degree of control and discretion over work may help employees to perform better in the face of high job demands. This environment provides employees with autonomy and flexibility on when and how to deal with their job demands. Apart from the above advantages, job resources also stimulate personal growth, learning, and development (Van Emmerik et al., 2012).

Van Emmerik et al. (2012) found the association between resources and employability was mediated by extrinsic motivation. This present study proposes that more job resources (skill discretion and decision authority) are directly good for employability. Transformational
leadership encourages employees in continuous learning, developing skills and provides them authority, which is doubtless favorable to their skill discretion and decision authority. Leaders who engage in individualized consideration by coaching and teaching should have followers who see more autonomy and feedback in their jobs (Piccolo and Colquitt, 2006).

Furthermore, transformational leadership supports followers by offering them more work-related resources, thus followers can feel less stress and process tasks as smoothly as possible. Transformational leadership is more likely to promote employees’ employability through skill discretion and decision authority.

This leads us to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2: Job characteristics will play a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability.

Hypothesis 2a: Job demands will play a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability.

Hypothesis 2b: Skill discretion will play a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability.

Hypothesis 2c: Decision authority will play a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability.

The role of social exchange

Seen by many researchers as one of the most influential conceptual paradigms in organizational behavior, social exchange is based upon trust, kindness, and respect (Hofmann and Morgeson, 1999; Cole et al., 2002; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Lavelle et al., 2007). The interaction between two agents (individuals or organizations) is central to social exchange theory (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). In the workplace, most workers form their
social exchange relationships with their organizations, supervisors and coworkers. This study takes into consideration three types of social exchange. Perceived organizational support (POS) refers to the “quality” of the social exchange that takes place between an employee and organization (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005), while leader-member exchange (LMX) and team-member exchange (TMX) have been viewed respectively as the exchange relationships that take place between an employee and the supervisor (Gerstner and Day, 1997), and between an employee and team members (Seers, 1989).

POS is valued as assurance that aid will be available from the organization when it is needed to carry out one’s job effectively and to deal with stressful situations (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Employees with a sense of POS feel that in circumstances where they need work or life support, the organization is willing to help (Hashemi et al., 2012). Supervisors always act as agents of the organization, responsible for directing and evaluating subordinates’ performance, so employees would view their supervisor’s favorable or unfavorable orientation toward them as indicative of the organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Transformational leadership supports and encourages employees whose work or lives require help, therefore employees would feel strong support from the organization, which then generates their level of responsibility to the organization. A study has found that perceived supervisor support leads to perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 2002). POS can strengthen employees’ sense that an organization recognizes and rewards their achievements. High POS represents employees’ self-perceived support from the organization, meaning that employees view their job or task more positively and have more resources to deal with a dilemma, contributing to employees’ employability.

LMX theory has long been recognized as an important leadership theory capturing dyadic relationships in organizations (Ozer, 2008). The relationally oriented nature as one factor of Chinese culture makes LMX an important type of exchange relationship in the
workplace (Loi et al., 2009). In general, leaders count on their followers to provide them with assistance whenever needed, and followers rely upon their leaders for support, encouragement, and career investments. Exchanges between leaders and followers can occur at any time. Idealized influence and individualized consideration can catalyze employees’ behaviors to strengthen the relationship with supervisors (Deluga, 1994). Gerstner and Day (1997) proposed to carry out conceptual and empirical research focusing on the relationship between transformational leadership and LMX. The review of the literature led the authors to believe that there is a positive association between transformational leadership and LMX (Wang et al., 2005; Asgari et al., 2008). Further, high quality LMX symbolizes support, acceptance, and security, and it can empower and motivate employees to try new things, which is of benefit to one’s ability and working skills. When employees have high quality LMX relationships, they value this personal relationship, and reciprocate by responding positively to demanding work expectations (Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007). During this process, they must improve their capacity in all aspects for not letting leaders down. Therefore, transformational leadership can influence followers’ employability through LMX.

Transformational leadership articulates a compelling vision of the future of the organization, encourages team collaboration and offers work-related assistance. Under such circumstances, team members work together and provide conditions necessary for enhanced perceptions of TMX. High quality TMX involves exchange of resources and support that goes beyond what is required for task accomplishment (Tse and Dasborough, 2008). A team member having high TMX shares information and knowledge with other members, and in turn he/she can get much more knowledge and novel thoughts from others. Liu et al. (2011) have found that work unit TMX increases the intention to share knowledge. It is understandable that one way to improve employees’ employability is to promote information
sharing and reinforce learning. Similar to LMX, TMX can act as the mediator between transformational leadership and employability. This leads us to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3: Social exchange will play a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability.

Hypothesis 3a: Perceived organizational support will play a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability.

Hypothesis 3b: Leader-member exchange will play a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability.

Hypothesis 3c: Team-member exchange will play a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability.

Methodology

Sample and procedure

The sample is composed of 760 participants (49.9% male, 48.0% female and 2.1% unspecified) employed in Yangtze Delta and Pearl River Delta in China. The participants have worked under their line manager for more than one year. Most participants are between 25 and 35 years old (57.8%), with the remaining participants under 25 years old (24.7%) and more than 35 years old (17.5%). Education levels of these participants included ‘below the high school education level’ (12.6%), ‘high school education level’ (17.6%), ‘junior college education level’ (29.3%), ‘college education level’ (41.7%), and ‘master education level’ (5.1%). They were employed on a full-time basis in general staff (54.5%), supervisor (15.1%), middle manager (16.2%) and senior manager (6.3%) positions.
In order to avoid possible common method bias, two waves of surveys (in 2014) on a stratified sample, included a mix of industries, such as construction, manufacturing, finance, insurance and communications, were used to investigate the proposed relationship between transformational leadership, job characteristics, social exchange and employability. In the first wave, employees completed a survey assessing control variables, transformational leadership, job characteristics and social exchange. Of 956 individuals invited, 925 returned the first-wave survey, of which 890 were valid. The second wave survey assessing employability took place after one week with the 890 employees. This wave of survey returned 825 responses, 760 of which were valid. The total response rate for the two waves was 82.15% (760 out of 925 responses).

Measures

Since the instruments used in the study were developed in English, careful forward-back translation procedures (Behling and Law, 2000) were used. A bilingual translator translated these scales into Chinese, and another bilingual translator having no knowledge of the original English scales back-translated them into English. Then, a group of HR scholars discussed the ambiguity of the translated script, making it clearer.

Transformational Leadership (TFL) was assessed using a 20-item scale from Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass and Avolio, 1995), including five sub-dimensions: Idealized Influence - Attribute, Idealized Influence - Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Responses were designed on a 5-point scale: 0 (‘Not at all’) and 4 (‘Frequently, if not always’). Sample items are as follows: ‘Articulates a compelling vision of the future’, ‘Gets me to look at problems from many different angles’.

Job Characteristics were measured in three dimensions — Job Demands (JD), Skill Discretion (SD), Decision Authority (DA) (Karasek, 1979). JD included seven items, with
answers ranging from 1=never to 5=extremely often. An example item is: ‘To what extent does your job require you working fast?’ SD and DA are separately assessed with two 4-item scales. Items are scored on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1=never to 5=extremely often. A sample item of SD reads ‘To what extent is high skill level required?’, while a sample item of DA reads ‘To what extent do you have the freedom to decide how to organize your work?’

Three Work-Related Sources of Social Exchanges were included: Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and Team-Member Exchange (TMX). To assess POS, we used the same six items developed in previous studies (Shanock and Eisenberger, 2006). An example item reads ‘My work organization strongly considers my goals and values’. Respondents indicated the extent of agreement with each statement on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree. As the item-total correlation was low and significantly reduced the scale’s reliability, we removed a reverse item to increase reliability. LMX was measured with a seven-item scale (Scandura and Graen, 1984). Sample items are, ‘How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?’ (1=‘extremely ineffective’, 5=‘extremely effective’) and ‘How well does your leader understand your job problem and needs?’ (1=’not a bit’, 5=‘a great deal’). TMX was measured with a 9-item scale (Seers, 1989). Items were rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1=very unlikely to 7=very likely. A sample item reads ‘My coworkers have asked for my expertise in solving a job-related problem of theirs’.

Employability (EA) was assessed with a 10-item scale developed in a seminal work by Rothwell and Arnold (2007). It contains two sub-dimensions: Internal Employability and External Employability. Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with each of the 10 statements on a 5-point scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree).
Sample items are, ‘Among the people who do the same job as me, I am well respected in this organization’ (internal employability), ‘The skills I have gained in my present job are transferable to other occupations outside this organization’ (external employability).

Moreover, we included control variables in order to isolate the test effects (Boselie et al., 2005) and followed Anand, Vidyarthi, Liden and Rousseau (2010) with an intention to use individual level control variables in testing the hypothesized leadership-employability social relationship. Specifically, the tests were controlled by gender (0=female, 1=male), age (1=below 25 years, 2=26-35 years, 3=36-45 years, 4=46-55 years, 5=above 55 years), education level (1 = below senior high school, 2 = senior high school, 3 = college, 4 = bachelor’s degree, 5 = master’s degree, and 6 = doctorate or above) and position level (1 = operational employee, 2 = first line manager, 3 = middle manager, and 4 = senior manager).

Data analysis and results

We followed the approach suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2003) to control and test common method bias. First, in addition to using the translation-back-translation method and panel discussion to ensure the quality of the items, we also provided detailed instructions about the research purpose and assured the anonymity of participation on the first page of the questionnaire. Second, the results of an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on all the measures showed there were 11 factors with eigenvalues greater than one. In addition, the Harman’s one-factor test did not identify any general factor that accounted for most of the variance among all the items, because the first factor explained only 35.89% of the total variance.
Third, the patterns of the scale variables were assessed. Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients (α) and correlations among all variables. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to evaluate the measurement of the scales (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). As illustrated in Table 2, The hypothesized CFA model (M1) specified 2 second-order scales (TFL and EA) and 6 first-order scales (JD, SD, DA; and POS, LMX and TMX). An acceptable model fit indices were found in the hypothesized model (M1): the χ² statistic was 4862.944 (d.f.=1952), Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation or RMSEA (0.044) and Standardized RMR or SRMR (0.057) were below the cut-off levels of 0.05 and 0.08 respectively (Schumacker and Lomax, 2004); and Comparative Fit Index or CFI (0.913) and Tucker-Lewis Index or TLI (0.904) were also above the threshold level of 0.9 (Byrne, 2010). Therefore, the hypothesized CFA model (M1) was selected, as it resulted in better goodness of fits compare to alternative models (M2-M6).

Finally, we tested our hypotheses via structural equation modeling (SEM) in AMOS (Arbuckle, 2006), assessing model fit via χ² and the χ²/df ratio, as well as with absolute (RMSEA) and relative indices (NFI, CFI, IFI) to evaluate the goodness of fit of the model. AMOS provides five SEM procedures for parameters estimation. Unweighted-least squares (ULS), Weighted-least squares (WLS) and Asymptotic-distribution free (ADF) require a sample > 1000, but make no distributional assumptions (Wu, 2009); Maximum Likelihood (ML) and Generalized Least Squares (GLS) require smaller samples. ML generates significantly less bias than GLS if the path model is correctly specified and the data are continuous and normally distributed (Olsson et al., 2000). We tested our hypotheses by ML. The hypothesized path model (P1) in which Job Characteristics (JD,
SD and DA) and Social Exchanges (POS, LMX and TMX) mediated between Transformational Leadership and Employability. As illustrated in Table 2, this model (P1) showed acceptable fit to the data: the $\chi^2$ statistic was 5456.779 (d.f.=2218), RMSEA (0.044) and SRMR (0.068) were below the cut-off levels of 0.05 and 0.08 respectively (Schumacker and Lomax, 2004), and Comparative Fit Index or CFI (0.904) and Tucker-Lewis Index or TLI (0.896) were also approaching the threshold level of 0.9 (Byrne, 2010). Therefore, the data-to-model fit is at a satisfactory level.

Bootstrapping Analysis in AMOS was employed to estimate the bias and aid the path estimations (Shrout and Bolger, 2002). The Bollen-Stine bootstrap analysis (sample size set to 2000) was used to evaluate bootstrap p-value, overall model fit and to validate and to compare each of the path estimates and their standard errors (Loehlin, 2004). The ML bootstrap analysis revealed that all the samples were useable (Byrne, 2010) and indicated that the data-to-model fit was good i.e. accept the modified model. As illustrated in Table 3 the bootstrap result indicated that the paths and estimates in the modified model were also significant and acceptable.

[Table 3 here]

Figure 1 depicts the model P1 which Job Characteristics (JD, SD and DA) and Social Exchanges (POS, LMX and TMX) partially mediated the effect of Transformational Leadership on Employability. The coefficient of the path from Transformational Leadership to three types of Job Characteristic (JD, SD and DA) and three types of Social Exchange (POS, LMX and TMX) were positive and highly significant. Additionally, the standardized effects of Transformational Leadership, three types of Job Characteristic (JD, SD and DA) and two types of Social Exchange (POS and TMX) on employability were significant, LMX was the exception. Therefore, all the hypotheses were supported except hypothesis 3b, which states that Leader-Member Exchange will play a mediating role in
the relationship between transformational leadership style and self-perceived employability, was not supported.

[Figure 1 here]

Discussion and conclusion

A considerable amount of research attention has been devoted to transformational leadership body of literature. In our research we empirically tested the relationship between transformational leadership and employability and the study made a number of important contributions. First, this study enriches the literature though the exploration of the mediating factors and illustration of the significance of indirect effects. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study applying job characteristics theory (Hackman and Oldham, 1975) and social exchange theory (Homans, 1958) to explain the effect of transformational leadership on employability. Consistent with previous findings (Camps and Rodriguez, 2011; Van der Heijden and Bakker, 2011), the data supported our hypothesis in that transformational leadership had a positive effect on employees’ employability.

Second, besides the direct effect, the results of our study showed that transformational leadership could also improve employees’ employability through job demands, skill discretion, decision authority, perceived organizational support and team-member exchange, but not leader-member exchange. This is consistent with our research hypotheses and is beneficial for understanding of the mediating mechanism between transformational leadership and employee employability. It shows that transformational leadership can positively affect employees’ employability by means of job characteristics and social exchange. With respect to job characteristics, the transformational leader is able not just to influence the employees to work harder and accomplish tasks faster, but rather stimulate the
followers to be more efficient and effective. Similarly, the transformational leader can enrich job resources, so the employees may feel that their work is non-repetitious, creative and skillful. This approach aims for greater freedom of employees, their control over their own decisions and autonomy in task accomplishment, which in turn forms a conducive mechanism of enhancement of employees’ employability. In terms of social exchange, a transformational leader can facilitate the creation of a specific organizational climate (i.e. perceived organizational support) and team climate (i.e. team-member exchange), thus, the employees have a sense of being respected, recognized and supported by the organization, in which cooperation among team members, friendship and sharing are embedded in its values. Good social climate is also conducive to the employees’ motivation to further enhance their employability.

Third, the study contributes to the broad notion of universal applicability of transformational leadership concept (Bass, 1997). Previous research has portrayed Chinese culture as more collectivist compared to most western cultures (Oyserman et al., 2002) and as rather inclined towards autocratic and command-based leadership styles (Newman and Butler, 2014). Given the recent opening-up to foreign direct investment, aiming to reform the largely inefficient state-owned enterprises, our research also addressed the calls made by professionals as to how to proceed with such needed drastic transformations in organization management, but also benefitting its employees. Transformational leadership exerts greater influence on the latter through participation and involvement, resulting in earning the required organizational commitment of the younger generation of employees, who are individualistic and value more self-enhancement, interest and creativity in the job (Fu and Tsui, 2003).

Fourth, the study findings show that, although followers in high-quality leader-member exchange relationships are more open to the social influence of transformational leaders and
it is easier for the former to achieve the goals set by the latter, the assumption that transformational leadership can improve leader-member exchange and then improve employees’ employability was not supported by the results. The main cause of this is that LMX does not make a unique prediction of employability. Firstly, because of the close relationship between them, the other variables shared the effect of leader-member exchange on employability. For instance, on one hand the effect of LMX on employees’ employability could be further mediated by other variables; as indicated by previous studies LMX can influence POS and TMX. On the other hand, POS and TMX include the element of LMX because a leader is the agent of an organization while also acting as the core member of the team. Secondly, there is a possibility that because of traditional Chinese culture high quality LMX may relate more to Guanxi and Renqing characteristics. Therefore top management care more about employees’ salaries and promotion opportunities, while putting less emphasis on developing employees’ creativity and their ability. Supervisor support is an important type of supervisor-subordinate Guanxi which is an indigenous Chinese construct (Cheung and Wu, 2011). Supportive supervision has a positive effect on the motivation and resultant performance of subordinates (Jin-liang and Hai-zhen, 2012). Job demands, skill discretion and decision authority are job characteristics. Transformational leadership gives employees jobs that require a variety of activities and appropriate demands, and encourages them to decide how their jobs should be done. These behaviors are all useful to promote employees’ employability.

Implications for management practice

Our study has important practical implications for leaders in the workplace who are interested in finding ways to stimulate employees’ employability in China. There is an indication that managers should show more transformational leadership behaviors, caring more about followers’ capacity and career development, thus establishing good relationships
with employees. Then, they should encourage employees to develop more skills to handle challenges at work. Similarly, by being given decision authority, employees can feel themselves more worthy and better control their work. Moreover, the impact of job demands cannot be ignored. Employees may lose their skills and employability if they are always asked to perform routine simple tasks. Transformational leadership can give followers appropriate pressure and the right level of job demands which can improve employees’ ability.

Besides, Chinese leaders should encourage followers’ communication and cooperation as employees obtain 80% of their knowledge at work by informal learning, such as learning from cooperation with coworkers (Weintraub and Martineau, 2002). By offering work-related assistance, team members can provide conditions necessary for enhanced perceptions of TMX (Tse and Dasborough, 2008), which is important for employability enhancement. It is necessary for Chinese organizations to give employees more support, such as offering them monetary rewards, protecting their labor rights, listening to their needs and providing formal and informal on the job training. Some evidence indicates that employees with high levels of POS judge their jobs more favorably and are more invested in their organizations (Chen et al., 2009). These actions are all favorable to employees’ development.

Limitations and future studies

This study is subject to a number of limitations that need to be addressed. First, the data were based on self-reports and there was only a week interval between the first and second surveys. In all contexts, employees’ self-reported data is unlikely to be free of social desirability bias (Ma and Qu, 2011). Future research may consider collecting data from different sources and allowing more time between surveys, however the focus of our study is on the cross-sectional, not a longitudinal data analysis, and therefore the two-wave survey interval is not mainly designed here to provide a reasonable time for inferring causality, but
rather to better prevent data from possible common method bias.

Secondly, this study has not explored the relationships between five dimensions of transformational leadership and employability. In the future, we need to examine the specific relationships in order to provide the targeted guiding opinions for management practice. Moreover, different leadership may have different effects on employees’ employability. It will be meaningful to connect different types of leadership styles to employees’ employability and explore which leadership style is more effective in improving employability. The results of this research also revealed that only the respondent’s work position was a significant control variable, therefore this variable deserves further research attention.

In conclusion, the present research opens a new direction for research concerning how transformational leadership influences employees’ employability. Thus, we suggest that more mediating factors (e.g. work autonomy, feedback and variety, intrinsic and extrinsic job opportunities, employability orientation, self-regulatory processes, development program participation) and moderating factors (e.g. core self-evaluations, career orientation, employability culture) can be incorporated in future studies. More research attention can also be paid to the leadership theories, which have in them a common underpinning concept of altruism (Sosik et al., 2009). We suggest examining the potential impact of altruistic leadership on employability, given a widely recognized trend of promoting positive change through ethics, social entrepreneurship and community volunteerism.

References


exchange, perceived organizational support, trust in management and organizational


Table 1. Means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients (α) and correlations among all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education level</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Position level</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TFL</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. JD</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SD</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. DA</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. POS</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. LMX</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TMX</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. EA</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01; The Employability (EA) data was from wave 2; the others were from wave 1.

Reliability coefficient (α) are in parentheses along the diagonal.
Table 2. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis and SEM Path Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1: Hypothesized</td>
<td>4862.944</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Loading items of POS, LMX, TMX into a factor SE</td>
<td>6302.477</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1439.533</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: Loading items of JD, SD, DA into a factor JC</td>
<td>5649.011</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>786.067</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: Loading items of POS, LMX, TMX into a factor SE, and loading items of JD, SD, DA into a factor JC</td>
<td>7058.119</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2195.175</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5: One higher-order factor model (Combining TFL, EA, SE, JC into a higher-order factor)</td>
<td>7100.663</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2237.719</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6: One factor model (Loading all items into a factor)</td>
<td>10116.113</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>5253.169</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1: Hypothesized Path model</td>
<td>5456.779</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TFL: Transformational Leadership; EA: Employability; POS: Perceived Organizational Support; LMX: Leader-Member Exchange; TMX: Team-Member Exchange; SE: Social Exchange; JD: Job Demands; SD: Skill Discretion; DA: Decision Authority; JC: Job Characteristics.
Table 3: Results of Mediation Tests Predicting Employability: Standardized Total, Direct and Indirect Effects of TFL through the Six Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFL→EA (Total effect)</td>
<td>0.719***</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL→EA (Direct effect)</td>
<td>0.205***</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL→EA through: (Indirect effects)</td>
<td>0.514***</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TFL: Transformational Leadership; EA: Employability; POS: Perceived Organizational Support; LMX: Leader-Member Exchange; TMX: Team-Member Exchange; JD: Job Demands; SD: Skill Discretion; DA: Decision Authority.
Figure 1. The structural model P1 with standardized coefficients (**: significant at P<.01; *: significant at P<.05).