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This paper extends recently developed theory on (a) typical, maximal and ideal idealized influence behavior leadership performances (IIB_T, IIB_M and IIB_I respectively) and (b) typical, maximal and ideal transactional leadership performances (TS_T, TS_M and TS_I respectively) by exploring the interactions among these six constructs. By exploring three performance levels of both the constructs, it increases diversification and precision of the assessment of idealized influence behavior and transactional leadership. By collecting data from Pakistan it presents non-western perspectives on idealized influence behavior, human resource development and leadership. It contributes to the body of knowledge in the domains of idealized influence behavior, human resource development, leadership development, human performance and research methods. It explores that the means of (a-i) IIB_T and IIB_M, (a-ii) IIB_T and IIB_I and (b) TS_T, TS_M and TS_I are distinct, disregarding homogeneity of idealized influence behavior leadership performance as well as transactional leadership performance. Furthermore, means of (c) IIB_I and TS_I are distinct, depicting that the respondents score differently on the constructs of idealized influence behavior leadership performance and transactional leadership performance at ideal level. But, means of (d) IIB_T and TS_T and (e) IIB_M and TS_M are not distinct, depicting that the respondents score more or less the same on the constructs of idealized influence behavior leadership performance and transactional leadership performance at each of typical as well as maximal level. It focuses on idealized influence behavior and human resource development by testing and presenting new theory of quantifying respondents’ (a) idealized influence behavior leadership development desire and potential as well as (b) transactional leadership development desire and potential. Mean of (a) IIB_I is greater than that of IIB_T and IIB_M and (b) TS_I is significantly greater than that of
TS_T and TS_M depicting that there is existing intrinsic desire among respondents to (a) 6.77 % enhance their idealized influence behavior leadership performance as well as (b) 11.81 % enhance their transactional leadership performance respectively. Mean of (a) IIB_M is greater than that of IIB_T and (b) mean of TS_M is greater than that of TS_T depicting that there is existing inherent potential among respondents to (a) 11.97 % enhance their idealized influence behavior leadership performance and (b) 9.41 % enhance their transactional leadership performance respectively. The paper increases our insight into idealized influence behavior and leadership development training by exploring that (i) the Pearson correlation coefficients between (i-a) IIB_T and TS_T, (i-b) TS_T and TS_I, (i-c) IIB_I and TS_M (i-d) TS_I and IIB_M and (i-e) IIB_T and IIB_M are significant depicting that those respondents who score high on one also score high on the other and vice versa; (ii) regression constants for the regression models of IIB_T, IIB_I, TS_M and TS_I are significant depicting that the researchers have to look for other variables to fully explain variance in these four constructs whereas the regression constants for the regression models of IIB_M and TS_T are not significant depicting that their significant regression coefficients and constructs fully explain variance in these two constructs; (iii) regression coefficients of (iii-a) IIB_T, IIB_M and TS_I in the regression model of TS_T, (iii-b) IIB_M, IIB_I and TS_I in the regression model of TS_M, (iii-c) IIB_T, IIB_M and TS_T in the regression model of TS_I, (iii-d) IIB_M, TS_T and TS_I in the regression model of IIB_T, (iii-e) TS_T, TS_I and IIB_T in the regression model of IIB_M and (iii-f) TS_M and IIB_I in the regression model of TS_I are significant depicting that these independent variables explain variance in their respective dependant variables. Hence the paper concludes that the training strategies are feasible to alter any of IIB_T, IIB_M, IIB_I, TS_T, TS_M or TS_I
for highly inspirationally behaved and engaged workforce but for some of these the researchers have to look for other variables too.