

THE INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN FEDERAL AND STATE POLYTECHNIC IN RIVERS

NWACHUKWU PRECIOUS IKECHUKWU AND IBIAMA KENNETH ADONYE AND EPELLE, EZEKIEL SOPIRINYE AND NWANKWOALA SMART CHIMMAEZE

LECTURER, DEPARTMENT OF PETROLEUM MARKETING AND BUSINESS STUDIES, FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC OF OIL AND GAS BONNY, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA

and

LECTURER, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AND LOGISTICS, FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC OF OIL AND GAS, BONNY, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.

and

STUDENT, MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT, IGNATIUS AJURU UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, RUMUOLUMINI, PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE

and

LECTURER, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AND LOGISTICS, FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC OF OIL AND GAS BONNY, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.

IJMSSSR 2019

VOLUME 1

ISSUE 6 NOVEMBER – DECEMBER

ISSN: 2582-0265

Abstract – This study has investigated the influence of leadership style on organizational performance in organization. The major objective was to determine influence of leadership styles on performance in organization. Transformational and transactional leadership styles were considered in this study. Transformational leadership behaviors and performance/outcome considered relevant in the study were charisma, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation/individual consideration; and effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction, respectively. Transactional leadership behaviours and performance/outcome variables were constructive/contingent reward and corrective/management by exception; and effort, productivity and loyalty/commitment, respectively. The predictor variable was Leadership Style Democratic, Autocratic and laissez faire and the criterion variable was firms performance. Cronbach alpha 0.9 using one way Anova etc. It was found that staffs with democratic inclinations account for more variance in performance than autocratic and laissez faire. The result showed that while transactional leadership style had significant positive influence on performance, transformational leadership style also had positive but insignificant influence on performance. The study concluded that transactional leadership style was more appropriate in inducing performance in organization than transformational leadership style.

Keywords: Leadership, Performance, Autocratic, Laissez Faire and Democratic

INTRODUCTION

Organization look for staff who can manage effectively and efficiently. But each staff is unique with his or her style depending on the situation and inclined paradigm. Staffial style is the pattern of thinking, feeling and behaviour that a staff uses to deal with people and situation. A staff has several staffial styles such as autocratic, bureaucratic, charismatic, democratic and laissez faire (nwachukwu, 2018).

managerial style have a great impact on the organizations operation. Effective managerial style can increase productivity, bring about empowerment, boost up employees morale, motivation and contributes positively to organization and so on. Leadership happen to be the core and of course the Nervous system in organizational solvency. (Hogan & Curphy, 2014; House Aditya, 2017; Judge & piccolo, 2004). Leadership leads to more productivity and profitability, but the extent of success depends on the style of the leader and the systematic

environment created for staff functionality.

Statement of the Problem

Consequently many leadership ideas within the last century have affected the general effectiveness of organizations productivity (Heurieglet, 2004). Leadership has a characteristic that distinguishes it as a dynamic symbolic movement where every employee looks up to for adjustment when necessary. These characteristics explain the vital sensitive and proper positioning of leaders in organization.

The absence of effective leadership is a serious problem endemic in many organizations. It is obvious that the resultant outcome is poor staff performance, absence of motivation, poor growth and development of the institutions. Hence, this would sort to investigate management leadership style and organizational performance.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of leadership style on organizational performance in federal and state polytechnics in rivers state .

The major objective was

To determine influence of leadership styles on performance in organization

To determine transformational and transactional leadership styles were considered in this study.

To determine transformational leadership behaviours and performance/outcome considered relevant in the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

From the above frameworks, leadership occurs when one individual influences other to perform voluntarily above the minimum requirement of their work. Organizations productivity is dependent on the leadership style adopted. This is to say that they are interwoven showing the leaders willingness, commitment, selflessness, pro-activeness etc. to act in a given way to bring forth increase in the profit margin of the firm, effectiveness, efficiency and general increase in employee performance and productivity. Leadership style should be dependent on the task and the people being led, the environment and the leader initiative. However, there are several types of leaders exhibiting different leadership characteristics. It is therefore a first step to understand leadership development by exposing the various styles of leadership.

Leadership style may be based on autocratic structure, people and production orientation. Empirical research conducted by Levin and white (1953) on leadership style, identified three major leadership styles:

1. Autocratic leader
2. Laissez faire leader
3. Democratic leader.

In autocratic leadership style, the leaders is very conscious of his position. He has little trust and faith in his subordinates and he feels that “pay” is a just reward for work and is the only reward that will motivate a worker. An autocratic leader gives orders and demands that they be carried out. No questions are allowed and no explanation given. The group members ensure no responsibility for performance and merely do what they are told. Consequently production is good when the leader is present, but drops in his absence.

Laissez faire leader has no confidence in his leadership ability. He does not get goals for the group and decision making is performed by whoever in the group is willing to accept it. Under laissez faire leadership style, productivity is generally low and work is sloppy. The group has little interest in their work morale and team work which are generally low.

Democratic leadership style reflects a leader to follower relationship. Where decision making is shared by the leaders and members of the group he leads. Under democratic leadership style, criticism and praise are objectively given. A feeling of responsibility is developed within the group and enhanced productivity. Performances are usually high. New ideas and changes are developed.

LEADERSHIP AND ORGANISATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY

Nwachukwu (2018) believed that participative leadership is the best style of leadership in managing an organization system of any type. Nwachukwu maintained that people react favorably to it in organization by increased productivity, lower unit cost, and good morale and improved labour management relation. According to Nwachukwu (2018), the worst style of leadership is autocratic and authoritarian leadership style which gives rise to high labour management conflicts.

Another leadership style which focuses on leader effectiveness is the contingency model or situational sensitive which is anchored on the leader's ability to analyze the situation at hand and appropriately adopting a suitable approach which best suites the circumstance. (Fredler 2017; House 2011; Vroon and Yelton 2014)

Etzion (2016) conducted a study to determine the relationship between leadership behaviours and determinant using 992 members of the organization and 846 personnel staffs in the District of Columbia; using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), it was observed that leadership style affects organizational performance.

Fieldler (2016) posited that the effectiveness of leadership to a large extent is responsible for organizational performance. Luthans (2008) maintained that staff (employees) perceives employers as the image of the organization. Employees, therefore internalize the culture and becomes part and parcel of the organization. Partharch (2005) confirmed the impact of the management styles on firms performance and further found a strong relationship between management styled and organizational performance.

METHODOLOGY

A sample size of 40 questionnaires was carried out. A random sampling was utilized to determine the predictive relationship between independent variables leadership style (autocratic, laissez faire and democratic leadership styles) and dependent variable (organizational performance). Also a cronbach alpha reliability test was done by using statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) version 10.

The population of the study consisted of faculty and departmental board of two federal and three state institutions (polytechnics) both academic and non-academic staff. The main instrument for the data collection was structured questionnaire designed in five point Likert of strongly agree to strongly disagree. And excellent, above average, below average and poor.

In order to ensure a high response rate, the questionnaires were handed personally to the respondent and collected immediately once they were completed by the respondent. Besides, some lecturers aided in the collection and completion of questionnaires.

DATA ANALYSIS

The scale meant for this study has been prelisted and validated in various studies (Fry and Matherly 2016; fry et al 2015; Pittinoky and Shih 2005; Meyer and Alden 2013 Larsen et al 2004, Overberghe et al 2013; Noordin and Nainudlin 2011) since all variables items employed in this study were sourced to existing and previously validated measurement scales.

We undertook a confirmatory test of internal consisting on the instrument with our style using cronbach alpha. The cronbach alpha calculates the average of all possible split half reliability coefficient and though 0.80 is the threshold level. 0.7 is generally accepted by the rule of thumb (bryman and belly 2003) and is considered adequate for the hypotheses testing in this study.

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

The test of hypothesis was to determine the influence of leadership style on organizational performance. The two measures of organization performance which was the criterion variable in this study were effectively and efficiency, correspondingly, leadership style which was the predictor variable was operationalized into three empirically represent, namely; autocratic, laissez faire and democratic leadership style. We adopted standard one

way of variance (ANOVA). The result is presented in the table 1.

TABLE 1

Summary data and one way analysis of variances (ANOVA) of the influence of leadership style on organizational performance (N = 370)

Leadership style	N	-	SD
Autocratic	124	24.82	1.59
Laissez Faire	147	25.84	2.19
Democratic	99	25.48	1.51
Total	370	25.41	1.88

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Between group	70.964	2	35.482		
Within group	1236.225	367	3.368	10.534	.000
Total	1307.189	369			

TABLE 2

Fishers least significance difference (LSD) multiple comparison analysis of the influence of leadership style on organizational performance.

Leadership style	Auto 124	Lai 147	Dem 99
Autocratic 124	24.84	-1.00	.064
Laissez Faire 147	-4.44	25.84	0.36
Democratic 99	-2.57	1.51	25.48

The result in Table 2 shows that respondent in their organizational performance from those whose leadership is either laissez faire or democratic. Also respondent whose leadership style is laissez faire were significantly different from those leadership style were democratic in their organizational performance.

DISCUSSION

From the study it was observed that democratic leadership style contributed significantly to organizational performance, than the autocratic and laissez faire style. This is because democratic leadership shares decision making with the group. Criticism and praise are objectively given. A feeling of responsibility is developed within the group.

From the study it was observed that the low and value for autocratic and laissez faire style is an indication that there was little freedom for the in group hostility and aggression, high level of mediocrity associated with atavistic

emotions, based on irrational motive. Their motivational level was very low and they feel insecure.

CONCLUSION

From the research it was observed that leadership style of the organization greatly influence the performance and organizational output. Organization will function effectively when management employs a proper leadership styled. Therefore harmony should be created between workers, management and the task environment.

RECOMMENDATION

From the study the following recommendation was suggested

1. We recommend that democratic, participatory and supportive leadership should exist within the organization ,especial in polytechnic this will not only promote unity among staff but also motivate them .
2. We recommend that leaders should set vibrant high performance organizational culture through interpersonal relation, dialogues and transparency.
3. It is recommended that leaders should adopt effective communication pattern to produce enthusiasm and foster an atmosphere of confidence within the organization.
4. A suggestion box as a feed back mechanism should be made available in the institution to every department to get information how a particular leadership style adopted has impacted the workers performance

REFERENCES

1. Barric, B. R., Day, D.V., Lord, R. G., & Alexander, R. A. (2011). "Assessing the Utility of Executive Leadership". *The leadership Quarterly*, 2(1), 9-22. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(91\)90004-L](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(91)90004-L)
2. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond Expectation*. New York: The free Press.
3. Bass, B. M., Avolio, B J. Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2013). "Predicting Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037.0021-9010.88.2.207>
4. Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leadership: the Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York.
5. Bertrand, M., & Scholar, A. (2013). "Managing with Style: the Effect of Staffs on Firm Policies". *Quarterly Journal Economics*, 118(4), 1169-1208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2391247>
6. Blake, R. R. and J. S Mouton, (2014), *The Staffial Grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
7. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
8. Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (2015). "Further Assessment of Bass's (2015) Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 468-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.4.468>
9. Choi, S. (2017). "Democratic Leadership: the Lessons of Exemplary Model for Democratic Governance". *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(3), 234-262.
10. Cole, N. D. (2004). "Gender differences in perceived disciplinary fairness". *Gender; Work and Organization*, 11(3), 254-227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00231.x>
11. Darcy, T., & Kleiner, B. H. (2011). "Leadership for Change in a Turbulent Environment". *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 12(5) 12-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437739110004569>
12. Denhardt, R. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2013). "The New Public Service: an Approach to Reform". *International Review of Public Administration*, 8(1), 3-10.
13. Elley, W. B. (1985). "Elley-Irvin Socio-Economic Index 1981 Census Revision". *New-Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 20(2), 115-128.
14. Fiedler F. E. (2016). "Research on Leadership Selection and Training: One View of the Future". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 241-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2393716>
15. Fok, L. y., S. M Crow, S. J. Hattman & A. Moore, (2014). "Management Style as an Element of Management Development Programs". *J. Management Development*, 13:25-33.
16. Fontaine, R. and S. Richardson, (2013). "Cross-Cultural Research in Malaysia". *Cross Cultural Management: An International J.* 10: 75-89
17. Fry, L. W. (2003) "Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership". *The Leadership Quarterly*. 14(6) 693-727. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001>.

18. Gabalda, B. (2012). "Development De la Notion De Priopriete: Evaluations Sociales et Morales". Doctoral Dissertation, Universite Rene Descartes-Paris V.
19. Gajem, Y. M., Warrick, A. W., & Myers, D. E. (2011). "Spatial Dependence of Physical Properties of a Typic Torrifluent Soil". *Soil Science of America Journal*, 45(4), 709-715. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1981.0361599500450007x>.
20. Gustainis, J.J.(2014)."Autocratic Leadership". *Encyclopedia of Leadership*, 68-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412952392.n21>.
21. Hamidifar, F. (2009). *A Study of The Relationship Between Leadership Styles And Employees Job Satisfaction At Islamic Azad University Branches In Thran*. Iran: Islamic Azad University Branches.
22. Hemphil, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (2017). "Development of Leadership Behaviour Descriptive Questionnaire". In Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.) *Leadership Behaviour: Descriptive and Measurement*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
23. Hennessy, J. T. (2018). Reinventing Government: Does Leadership Makes a Difference? *Public Administration Review*, 58(6), 522-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/977579>.
24. Hill Jr. R. w., Gordon, A. S., & Kim, J. M. (2004) *Learning The Lessons Of Leadership Experience: Tools For Interactive Case Method Analysis*. California: University of Southern California Marina Del Rey.
25. Hofstede, G., (2011). *Cultures Consequences*. (2nd E). Thousand Oaks: pp: 44, et seq.
26. Hogan, R., Curphy, G. j.,& Hogan, J.(1994)"What We Know About Leadership: Effectiveness And Personality". *America Psychology*, 49(6), 403 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300306>
28. House, R. (2011) "A Path-Goal Theory of Leadership". *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-97.
29. House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (2014) "What we Know About Leadership. Effectiveness and Personality". *American Psychologist*, 46(6), 493. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177//014920639702300306>
30. Personality". *American Psychologist*, 46(6), 493. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177//014920639702300306>
31. Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2013). "Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Locus of Control and Support for Innovation: Key Prediction of Consolidated-Unit Performance". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.6.891>
32. Hunt, J. G. (2011) *Leadership: A New Synthesis*. Sage publication, Inc.
33. Judge, T. A., piccolo, R. f., 7 llies, R. (2004). "The Forgotten Ones? The Validity of Consideration and Initiating Structure in Leadership Research". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 36-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.36>
34. Khurana, R. (2002). *Searching for a Corporate Savior: the Irrational Quest for Charismatic CEOs*. Princeton University Press.
35. Koene, B. A., Vogelaar, A. L., & Soerters, J. L. (2002). "Leadership Effects on Organizational Climates and Financial Performance". Local Leadership Effect in Chain Organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 193-215. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843\(02\)00103-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843(02)00103-0).
36. Luthans, F., D. H. B. Welsh and S. A. Rosenkrants, (1993). "What Do Russians Staff Really Do? An Observational Study with Comparison to US Staff". *J. Int. Business Studies*, P. 741-759
37. Really Do? An Observational Study with Comparison to US Staff". *J. Int. Business Studies*, P. 741-759
38. Luthar, H. K. (2016). "Gender Differences in Evaluation of Performance and Leadership Ability". *Autocratic vs. Democratic Staffs. Sex Roles*, 35(5-6), 337-361. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01664773>
39. Matsa, D., & Miller, A. (2011). Chipping Away at the Glass Ceiling: Gender Spillovers in Corporate Leadership. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1709462>.
40. Misumi, J. and Peterson, (2015). "The Performance –Maintenance Theory of Leadership".
41. *Review of a Japanese res. Program. Admin. Sci.* 30:198-223.
42. Mullins, L. J. (1999). *Management and Organizational Behaviour*. London: Financial Times. Nicholls, J. (2018) The Transforming Autocrat. *Management today*, march, 114-18. Northouse, P. G. (2004). "Leadership Theory and Practice". *Pastoral Psychology*, 56(4), 403-411
43. O'Reilly, C., Tushman, M., & Harreld J. B. (2009). *Organizational Ambidexterity: IBM and Emerging Business Opportunities*.
44. Ogbonn, E., & Harris, L. (2000). "Leadership Style, Organizational Culture and Performance: Empirical Evidence From UK Companies". *International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, 11(4), 766-788. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190050075114>
45. Ogbonna, E.(2013)."Managing Organizational Culture:Fantasy and Reality?" *Hman Resource Management Journal*, 3(2), 42-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.1992.tb00309.x>.
46. *Resource Management Journal*, 3(2), 42-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.1992.tb00309.x>.
47. Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (1998) "Organizational Culture: Compliance of Genuine Change?" *British*

- Journal Management*, 9, 273-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00098>
48. Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2018) "Organizational Culture: It's Not What You Think".
 49. *Journal of General Management*, 23(3), 35-48.
 50. Porter, L., & McKibben, L. M. (1988). *Management and Development: Drift of Thrust Into the 21st Century?*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
 51. Quick, J. C. (1992). "Crafting an Organizational Culture: Herb's Hand at Southwest Airlines".
 52. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21(2), 45-56. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(92\)90063-s](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(92)90063-s).
 53. Saari, L., Johnson, T. R., McLaughlin, S. D., & Zimmerly, D. M. (1988). "A survey of Management Education Practice in the U.S. Companies". *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 731-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00650.x>
 54. Sanders, J. O., & Sanders J. O., (2007) *Spiritual Leadership. A Commitment to Excellence for every Believe*.
 55. Simms, J. (2017). "Beauty Queen". *Marketing Business*, March, 48-51
 56. Stogdill, R. M (1963). *Manual for leadership for leadership descriptive questionnaire form XII*. Columbus, OH: the Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research.
 57. Tabachnick, L., & Fidell, B. (2016) *Using Multivariate Statistics*. New York: New York Harper Collins College Publishers.
 58. Waldman, D. A., Bass, B., & Yammarino, F. (1990). "Adding to Contingent-Reward Behaviour the Augmenting Effect of Charismatic Leadership". *Group and Organization Management*, 15(4), 381-394. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/105960119001500404>.
 59. White, R., & Lippitt, R., (1968). *Leadership And Member Reaction In Three Social Climates: Group Dynamics* (pp.318-385).
 61. Wilson, J. M., George, J., Wellins, R. S., & Byham W. C. (1994). *Leadership Trapeze: Strategies for Leadership in Team-Based Organization*. Jossey-Bass Publisher.
 63. Yukl, G. A. (1994) *Leadership in Organization*. Englewood cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.