

## EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON PERFORMANCE OF TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN ADAMAWA STATE, NIGERIA

**JOHN Ldama (Ph.D)**

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences,  
Adamawa State University, Mubi, Nigeria  
E-mail: ldamajohn2010@gmail.com

**KEFAS Bitrustumba**

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences,  
Adamawa State University, Mubi, Nigeria  
E-mail:kefasbitrus2@gmail.com

**STEPHEN Pembi**

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences,  
Adamawa State University, Mubi, Nigeria  
E-mail: stephenpemb@gmail.com

### Abstract

*The study aimed at assessing the effect of leadership styles on the Performance of selected tertiary institutions in Adamawa state. The main objective of this study was to assess the effect of different leadership styles (democratic and autocratic leadership styles) on organizational performance (growth and commitment). The study was guided by two research objectives and two research hypotheses. A survey research strategy was adopted, 3887 staff of Adamawa State University Mubi, Federal Polytechnic Mubi and College of Education Hong was use as population of the study, and 401 employees were selected as a sample size using Yamani formula. Questionnaire designed on five point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) was used as data collection instrument. Regression analysis was used as instrument to examine the effects of leadership style on performance. The findings of this study shows that democratic leadership styles has positive significant effects on organizational growth and autocratic leadership styles has negative effects on organizational commitment. The findings of this research show that democratic leadership style lead to rapid growth. Therefore, organization that requires rapid growth should adopt democratic leadership style. This study suggests that future researchers should extend the research to profit making organization and include other variable of dependent and independent variable.*

**Keywords:** Leadership style, effect, organization, performance, tertiary institution

### Introduction

In today's competitive workplace, managers should equip themselves with leadership

orientation and knowledge of employee behaviours this is because doing business in a competitive environment, regardless of the field of production or service, require leaders to have a clear vision and direction to maintain and develop the organization.

Dalluay and Jalagat (2016) view leadership as part and parcel of organization's existence regardless of the type of organization. Whether the organization is profit or non-profit oriented, leadership plays an important role in managing and leading the human resources, facilities, budgets and other resources in an efficient and effective manner. According to Mosadeghrad (2003) there are different styles of leadership in use depending on the situations and circumstances of the organization and the style of leadership that fit it; these include autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic transformational and transactional leadership.

According to Richard (2015) organizational performance encompasses three specific areas of organizational outcomes: financial performance (profits, return on assets, return on investment, etc.), product market performance (sales, market share, etc.) and shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc.) Specialists in many fields are concerned with organizational performance including strategic planners, operations, finance, legal, and organizational development. Organizational performance has certain factors that improve sustainability on the basis of effectiveness, efficiency, commitment and growth (Stephen, Eke & Cinjel, 2018). The improvement in productivity leads to employee's better behaviours and as norms; values and objectives help in improving culture of an organization. In relation to this study, it sought to determine the effects of leadership styles on tertiary institutions in Adamawa State.

Adamawa state is located in the north east region in Nigeria, it has 12 tertiary institutions. This study suggested that; the inability to meet performance targets like school calendar, staff welfare among others due to the inadequate strategic interventions of specific leadership styles, poor approaches in leadership styles and in fact the leadership style of the tertiary institution in Adamawa State is administrative in nature. Despite the changing of the management and council members the above problems are still in place and remain unsolved, this was continuously affecting organizational performance and the deliverance of quality services to the community had hugely been affected, hence warranting the study on the effect of leadership style on organizational performance in tertiary institutions in Adamawa State.

A study was conducted by Nandutu, Magôlo and Gimuguni (2014) at Uganda on the effect of leadership styles on performance of local governments, a case of Mbale district, that there is a moderate high positive and significant relationship between the three leadership styles (autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic), and performance in Mbale local government. To the researchers' knowledge, most of studies on leadership style were carried out outside Nigeria and outside Adamawa state, also focused on manufacturing organization and banking sector. It is on this ground that this study examines the effect of leadership styles on performance of tertiary institution of learning in Adamawa state.

### Research Hypotheses

**Ho<sub>1</sub>.** A democratic leadership style has no significant effect on organizational growth in tertiary institution in Adamawa state.

**Ho<sub>2</sub>.** An authoritative leadership style has no significant effect on organizational commitment in tertiary institution in Adamawa state.

### Theoretical Framework

This study adopted the McGregor theory (1960) which proposed that leadership strategies are influenced by a leader's assumptions about human nature. As a result of his experience as a consultant, McGregor summarized two contrasting sets of assumptions made by managers in industries. He developed two attitude profiles, or assumptions, about the basic nature of people. These attitudes were termed „Theory X and Theory Y. McGregor maintained that many leaders in essence subscribe to either Theory X or Theory Y and behave accordingly. Theory X managers believes that the average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if possible; because of this human characteristic, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort to achieve organizational objectives; and the average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition and wants security above all else. While theory Y managers believes that the expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest, and the average human being, under proper conditions, learns not only to accept but also to seek responsibility; people will exercise self-direction and self-control to achieve objectives to which they are committed and the capacity to exercise a relatively high level of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population, and the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized under the conditions of modern industrial life.

It can therefore be seen that a leader holding Theory X assumptions would prefer an autocratic style, whereas one holding Theory Y assumptions would prefer a more Democratic style. The real value of McGregor's work was to the idea that a leader's attitude towards human nature has a large influence on how that person behaves as leader. Thus the relationship between a leader's expectation and the resulting performance of a subordinate has received much attention. This theory suggests that a manager's assumptions and beliefs about nature of the individual determined his leadership behaviour.

### Conceptual Clarification

#### Leadership

According to Kumar (2014) leadership is defined as a process by which a person influences others to accomplish an objective and directs the organization in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent. These are accomplished through the application of leadership attributes, such as beliefs, values, ethics, character, knowledge, and

skills. Leadership is the integrated sharing of vision, resources, and value to induce positive change. It is the ability to build up confidence and zeal among people and to create an urge in them to be led.

### **Leadership Styles**

According to Miller *et. al.*, (2007) cited in Mercy (2014) the term leadership style refers to the pattern of interacting with subordinates in organization: how to direct and control the work of others, and how to get them to produce the goods and services. It includes not only the manner of giving instructions, but the methods and techniques use to motivate workers and to assure instructions are carried out.

Basically every leader has a different behaviour in leading his followers, it is called leadership style. Cuadrado *et al* (2007) cited in Celestine (2015) described leadership style as consistent set of behaviours /patterns, proposing two dimensions in leader's behaviour, structure initiation which includes task oriented leaders and consideration which includes relation oriented leaders. Memon (2014) defines leadership style as a leader's style of providing direction, motivating people and implementing plans. Leadership styles are seen as approaches that leaders use when leading organizations, departments, or groups (Mehmood & Arif, 2011) Leaders who search for the most effective leadership style may find that a combination of styles is effective because no one leadership style is best (Darling & Leffel, 2010). Leadership is the influencing process of leaders and followers to achieve organizational objectives through change (Omolayo, 2007; Lussier & Achua, 2009).

### **Approaches to Leadership Styles**

According to Cole and Kelly (2011) leadership theories focus on leader traits, behaviour (what the leader actually does), the power influence approach (the amount and type of power and how it is exercised), the situation or some combination therefore. Early leadership theories tended to be more universal in nature, i.e. applied to all types of situation, whereas more recently contingency theories of leadership have emerged, suggesting that certain aspects of leadership may apply to some situation but not others.

Since the 1950's, in particular, several theories about leadership or management style have been proposed. These have tended to be expressed in terms of authoritarian versus democratic styles, people orientation versus task orientation (Cole & Kelly, 2011). The behavioural approach examines leadership behaviour particularly that which influences the performance and motivation of subordinates, as result emphasis is placed on leadership style (Brooks, 2009). The path goal theory argues that subordinates are motivated by their leader to the extent that the behaviours of that leader influence their expectancies. In other words, the leader affects subordinates' performance by clarifying the behaviours (paths) that will lead to desired rewards (Griffin & Moorhead, 2012).

The Situational leadership model developed by Hersey and Blanchard focuses on the readiness of followers, in particular. Readiness is the extent to which people have the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task. Hersey and Blanchard argue that

situational leadership requires adjusting the leaders' emphasis on task behaviours (for example, giving guidance and direction) and relationship behaviours (for example, providing socio-emotional support) according to the readiness of followers to perform tasks (French *et. al*, 2008). The success of an influence attempt can be evaluated in terms of how it affects the way people subsequently view the leader for example ethical, supportive, competent, trustworthy (Conger & Riggio, 2007).

### **Types of leadership styles**

Leadership is increasingly taking place within a team context. As teams grow in popularity, the role of the leader in guiding team members takes on heights importance. And the role of team leader is different from the traditional leadership role performed by first-line supervisors (Robbins & Judge, 2007). According to Locke (2004), the outcome of an influence attempt depends on what tactics are used, how skilfully they are used, and the context in which they are used. The leadership style ranges from autocratic, Democratic, Transactional, Transformational and laissez-faire leadership style. However, this paper is limited to Autocratic and Democratic leadership style.

### **Autocratic Leadership Style**

Autocratic leaders are classic “do as I say” types. Typically, these leaders are inexperienced with leadership thrust upon them in the form of a new position or assignment that involves people management. Autocratic leaders retain for themselves the decision- making rights. They can damage an organization irreparably as they force their 'followers' to execute strategies and services in a very narrow way, based upon a subjective idea of what success looks like. There is no shared vision and little motivation beyond coercion. Commitment, creativity and innovation are typically eliminated by autocratic leadership. In fact, most followers of autocratic leaders can be described as biding their time, waiting for the inevitable failure this leadership produces and the removal of the leader that follows (Iqbal, Anwar & Haider, 2015). Michael, 2010). Chris (2016), 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.

### **Democratic/Participative Leadership Style**

One of the trademarks of the democratic style is the freedom of the workers to express their views and participation in the decision making process as it is most known as bureaucracy with bureaucratic view. Specifically, every decision undertaken by the management should first consider consultation with the workers and they can suggest ways in solving problems or in the decision process by participating in the decision although the leader has still the final say in those decisions. This leadership style is appropriate only in instances where the nature of the responsibility associated with the decision is such that group members are willing to share with their manager, or alternatively the manager is willing to accept responsibility for decisions, which he or she has not made personally. This leadership is viewed as an important aspect of

empowerment, teamwork and collaboration. It has been observed that an organization is more effective when those who will be affected by the organization's decisions are fully involved in the decision-making process. It is believed that subordinates share a sense of responsibility for the organization when they are allowed to participate actively in decision-making (Prerez, Milstein, Wood & Jacquez 1999). The participative style of leadership wastes time due to endless meetings and may lead to confusion and lack of direction. By implication, it is not appropriate for use in times of crisis when the situation demands on-the-spot decision. Seeking advice from an uninformed or incompetent group of subordinates may lead to disaster. However, (Goleman, 2002) posit that a democratic leader keeps staff morale high and therefore positive climate prevails in the organization.

### **Organizational Performance**

An organization is a consciously coordinated social unit, composed of two or more people that functions on a relatively continuous basis to achieve common goals (Robbins, 2003). Organizations can also be seen as a system of roles and stream of activities designed to accomplish shared purpose (Robey&Sales, 2014), a definition that emphasizes the importance of organizational structure and processes in pursuit of common goals. However they are defined and whatever their peculiarities, all organizations are characterized by coordination of efforts, a common goal, division of labour and a hierarchy of authority (Schein, 2014). As a result of greater competition in the global marketplace the majority of organizations have greatly streamlined their operations (Collis & Montgomery, 2008). Every moment presents a diverse set of challenges and obstacles: laws and regulations are evolving, the economy is altering, and, most importantly, no one is aware of what problems or obstacles will arise. Furthermore, organizations can also perform well or poorly due to external forces, such as interest rates and taxation

### **Organizational Commitment**

Why some people like to stay within one organization for their whole life? What binds an individual to the organization? What factors can be found common to those employees, who feel they would not like to change the organization? All of these questions are focused when examining organizational commitment, every person working in any work-related organization is automatically part of some bigger group. Employee is a member of a collective and this invisible tie between an employee and a collective is being studied when we are interested in organizational commitment (Elina, 2014). Organizational Commitment means a psychological attachment, sense of belongingness and motivation to contribute to the organizational development. It is a process in which employees think that it is their moral and ethical responsibility to think for the organization's future and investing time in organizational development will eventually be helpful in meeting their personal goals as well (Gautam, Van Dick & Wagner, 2004). Miller (2013) also states that organizational commitment is "a state in which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals, and wishes to maintain membership in the organization". Organizational commitment is therefore, the degree in which an employee is willing to maintain membership due to interest and association with the organization's goals

and values. In addition, Morrow (2016) describes organizational commitment as characterized by attitude and behaviour.

Miller (2013) describes an attitude as “evaluative statements or judgments either favourable or unfavourable concerning a phenomenon, basically, organizational commitment is a bridge that connects the employees with their organization. It measures the level of involvement and attention that each individual of the company puts in and also it tells how integrated are the goals of individuals with the goals of the organization (Feather & Rauter, 2004). There are different levels of individuals commitment based on development of the different stages of commitment in individuals According to Reichers 1985, adopted in Ronal(2015), the levels of commitment may be divided into the three levels of higher, moderate, and lower levels of commitment.

### **Organizational growth**

Growth is something for which most organization strives, regardless of their size. Small firms want to get big, big firms want to get bigger. Indeed, organization has to grow at least a bit every year in order to accommodate the increased expenses that develop over time. With the passage of time, salaries increase and the costs of employment benefits rise as well. Even if no other company expenses rise, these two cost areas almost always increase over time. It is not always possible to pass along these increased costs to customers and clients in the form of higher prices. Consequently, growth must occur if the organization wishes to keep up. Many small firms desire growth because it is seen generally as a sign of success, progress. Organizational growth is, in fact, used as one indicator of effectiveness for small businesses and is a fundamental concern of many practicing managers (Boggs, 2015).

According to Roberts (2017) organizational growth, however, means different things to different organizations. There are many parameters use to measure growth. Since the ultimate goal of organization differ from another organization some measure their growth in terms of net profit, revenue, and other financial data. Other business owners may use one of the following criteria for assessing their growth: sales, number of employees, physical expansion, success of a product line, or increased market share. Ultimately, success and growth will be gauged by how well an organization does relative to the goals it has set for itself.

### **Leadership style and performance**

Leadership has the most dynamic effects during individual and organizational interaction. In other words, ability of management to execute "collaborated efforts" depends on leadership capability. Lee and Chuang (2009) explain that the excellent leader not only inspires subordinates potential to enhance efficiency but also meets their requirements in the process of achieving organizational goals. Fry (2003) explains leadership as use of leading strategy to offer inspiring motive and to enhance the staff's potential for growth and development. Several reasons indicate that there should be a relationship between leadership style and organizational performance. The first is that today's intensive and dynamic markets feature innovation-based competition, performance rivalry, decreasing returns, and the



creative destruction of existing competencies. Studies have suggested that effective leadership behaviours can facilitate the improvement of performance when organizations face new challenges (McGrath & MacMillan, 2000). Mehra, Smith, Dixon and Robertson (2006) argue that when organizations seek effective ways to enable them outperform others; a long standing approach is to focus on the effects of leadership. Team leaders are believed to play a pivotal role in shaping collective norms, helping teams cope with their environments, and coordinating collective action.

### Empirical Review

Leadership and Organizational performance has received substantial attention in the past studies due to its significance. To begin with, in the study of leadership and organizational performance by Obiwuru, Okwu, Akpa and Nwankere (2011), the study followed a survey design and employed evaluative quantitative analysis method, performance was measured upon effort, productivity and loyalty. However, their study was concentrated on transformational and transactional leadership styles; thereby neglecting other styles of leadership such as democratic and autocratic styles. Also, their study focused on small and medium scale enterprise (SMEs) in Lagos. This makes it difficult to be applicable in tertiary institutions. Furthermore, Ryan and Tipu (2013) analysed 548 participants in Pakistan to study the impact of leadership on organizational performance using correlation analysis. Their study identified two types of leadership styles, transactional and transformational leadership styles. Besides, the study was conducted in Pakistan, which makes the result difficult to be applicable in the Nigerian context.

Raja and Palanichamy (2015) examined the effect of leadership styles on employee performance in public and private sector enterprises in India. Using 43 middle-level managers and 156 subordinates, the study results show adequate evidence, at the 5% level of significance, that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and employee performance, there is a significant positive relationship between transactional leadership and employee performance. However, their study was conducted in India which makes its applicability difficult in Nigeria. Kerns (2004) deliberated on the relationship of values to organizational leadership and his study was enormously in support of the laissez-faire style in linking the gap between the employer and employee where his concern was solely on the fact that laissez-faire would create a positive environment through which employees and employers felt like a family regardless of their positions. However, the study found that laissez-faire leadership had a negative relationship with the employee performance.

Basit, Sebastian and Hassan (2017) in their survey examined the impact of leadership style on employee performance of private organizations in Malaysia with a sample size of 100 employees; using regression analysis they found that democratic leadership style has a positive impact on employee performance, while autocratic leadership style on the other hand has a negative impact on employee performance. However, their study was conducted in private organizations and outside Nigeria which makes it difficult to apply the results in the public organization and Nigerian context respectively due to cultural differences and the mode of operations of private



organization differs from publication institutions.

A study in Uganda on the effect of leadership styles on performance of local governments, a case of Mbale district done by Nandutu et al., (2014) concluded that there is a moderate high positive and significant relationship between the three leadership styles (autocratic, lassies-faire, democratic), and performance in Mbale local government. To the researchers' knowledge, most of studies conducted on leadership style and organizational performance were carried out outside Nigeria and Adamawa state in particular, also focused on manufacturing organization, local government and banking sector.

**Research Methodology**

This study adopts survey research design. In accordance with Bryman and Bell (2015), using a survey strategy gives researcher more control over the research process and when sampling is used, it is possible to generate findings that are representative of whole population at a lower cost than collecting data for the whole population. The data collection techniques methods that tend to be used in surveys are questionnaires (Quinlan, 2011). The population of this study was 3887, which comprises of the academic and non-academic staff of Federal Polytechnic Mubi, College of Education Hong and Adamawa State University Mubi. Yemani (1964) method of calculating sample was used to obtain sample size from the population of 3887.

The formula is shown below;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + \frac{N \cdot e^2}{3887}} \text{ Where;}$$

n = sample size, N = total population of the study and e = expected sample error

$$n = \frac{3887}{1 + 3887(0.05)^2} \quad n = \frac{3887}{1 + 9.7175}$$

$$n = \frac{3887}{10.7175} \quad n = 401$$

Therefore, the sample size is 401. Regression analyse was use d to test the two null research hypothesis by the aid of Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.

**Model specification**

The model specification for the study is mathematically express as follow:

$$OG = \beta_0 + \beta_1 DLS + \beta_2 OC + \epsilon \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

$$ALS = \beta_0 + \beta_1 DLS + \beta_2 OC + \epsilon \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

**Where:** OG is organizational growth, DLS is democratic leadership style, OC is organizational commitment, ALS is autocratic leadership style, β is the intercept and ε is error.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The researcher distribute 450 questionnaires for safety net, and 390 was retrieved the analysis is based on retrieved questionnaires

**Ho,** A democratic leadership style has no significant effect on organizational growth in tertiary institution in Adamawa state.

**Table 1: Coefficients of determination of the effect of democratic leadership style on organizational growth**

Model	B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients (β)	t-values	p-values	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	6.140	.621		9.882	.000		
DLS	.563	.041	.591	13.834	.000	1.000	1.000

p<0.05 (significant)

a. Dependent Variable: OG

The information on table 1, shows that  $t=13.834$ , and  $p= 0.000$ , thenull hypothesis was rejected

**Ho<sub>2</sub>.** An authoritative leadership style has no significant effect on organizational commitment in tertiary institution in Adamawa state.

**Table 2: Coefficients of determination of the effect of authoritative leadership style on organizational commitment**

Model	B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients (β)	t-values	p-values	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	19.358	.598		32.385	.000		
ALS	.028	.048	.031	.586	.558	1.000	1.000

p>0.05 (not significant)

a. Dependent Variable: OC

The evidence on table 2 shows that  $t=0.586$  and  $p=0.558$  null hypothesis was accepted.

### Discussion of Findings

The evidence on table 1 show that null hypothesis was rejected because  $p<0.05$ . That is democratic leadership style have significant effects on organizational growth. The result was in line with that of Raja and Palanichamy (2011), who examined the effect of democratic leadership styles on employee performance in public and private sector enterprises in India. Also, this finding is in conformity with finding of Basit, Sebastian and Hassan (2017) who found a positive and significant effect of democratic leadership style on employee performance. Hypothesis 2 was accepted that autocratic leadership style does not have significant effects on organizational commitment based on table 2 where  $p>0.05$ . This result agrees with the study of Ryan and Tipu (2013) analysed 548 participants in Pakistan to study the impact of autocratic leadership on organizational performance which also show negative effects.

### Conclusion and Recommendations

From the findings of this research, it was revealed that democratic leadership style has significant effect on organizational growth which is human oriented. The results confirmed that “boss” attitude towards subordinates staff influence their performance at work. The study also indicated that leader, follower's relationship enhances workers

performance and all other important aspect that contributed to organizational success is team work. Furthermore, it was also revealed that involvement of employee in decision making is very important for accomplishment of desired goal. Finding also confirmed that autocratic leadership style could cause lack of commitment on the part of the subordinates, which will low organizational performance. Arising from the findings and conclusions, the following, recommendation was made:

- i. The leader should endeavour at all times to create a good working relationship between him and the organizational members since it is believed that his attitude influences employee's performance. The leadership in organization should avoid imposing policy on employee.
- ii. The employees should see the organization as their source of livelihood that is, means of their survival. The management should also see the employees as partners in progress and they should not be used as tools but as factor of production whose contributions should not be neglected.
- iii. Finally, there should be vertical co-operation at all levels in the organization that is, from top management to the least employee in the organizational and vice-visa because one person cannot enhance organizational growth, it must be a team work of all concerned in the organization to achieve a desired success.

#### **Suggestions for Further Studies**

This study examined how leadership styles (democratic and autocratic) affect organizational performance (growth and commitment) in selected tertiary institutions in Adamawa state, further studies can be extended to North-East or Nigeria. Organizational performance and leadership style have reverse effects on each other but, the introduction of moderator such as power distance will control the reversal effect. Future research could focus on other types leadership styles that might also affect organizational performance and not only the democratic and autocratic leadership styles. Future researchers can focus on other organizational performance variable such as effectiveness and efficiency other than growth and commitment.

#### **Reference**

- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (2004). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4:231-272.
- Basit, A., Sebastian, V. & Hassan, Z. (2017). Impact of leadership style on employee performance (a case study on a private organization in Malaysia). *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, 5 (2), 112-130.
- Brooks, I. (2009). *Organizational Behaviour, Individuals, Groups and Organization*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Essex, ENG: Pearson Education Limited.
- Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2015). *Business Research Methods*, 4<sup>th</sup> eds. Oxford: Oxford

University Press

- Celestine A. A. (2015). *Effects of leadership styles on employee performance at boac Kenya limited*. Master's thesis, The Open University of Tanzania.
- Chris, U. A. (2016). The influence of leadership styles on organizational performance in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management* 4 (4), 25-34.
- Cole, G. A. & Kelly, P. (2011). *Management Theory and Practice*. 7th ed. Hampshire, UK: Cengage Learning EMEA.
- Collis, D. J. & Montgomery, C. A. (2008). *Competing on Resources*. Harvard Business Review July–August, Issue, 1-13
- Dalluay, V. S. & Jalagat, R. C. (2016). Impacts of leadership style effectiveness of managers and department heads to employees' job satisfaction and performance on selected small-scale businesses in Cavite, Philippines. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behaviour and Decision Sciences (IJRAOB): An Online International Research Journal*, 2 (2), 734-751
- Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 81–94.
- French, R., Rayner, C., Rees, G. & Rumbles, S. (2008). *Organizational Behaviour*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gautam, T., Van Dick, R., & Wagner, U. (2004). Organizational identification and Organizational commitment: *Distinct aspects of two related concepts*. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7(3), 301–315.
- Griffin, R. W. & Moorhead, G. (2012). *Managing Organizational Behavior*. 10th ed. Mason, OH: South Western Cengage Learning.
- Iqbal, N., Anwar, S. & Haider, N. (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(5), 1-6.
- Kerns, C. D. (2004). *Strengthening values centered leadership*. *Graziadio Business Report*, 7 (2), 15-25.
- Lee, J., & Peccei, R. (2007). *Perceived organizational support and affective commitment: the mediating role of organization-based self-esteem in the context of jobs insecurity*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(6), 661–685.

- Locke, E. A. (2004). *Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behavior*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mehmood, Z. U. & Arif, M. I. (2011). Leadership and HRM: Evaluating new leadership styles for effective human resource management. *International Journal of Business and social science*, 2(15), 236-238.
- Nandutu, J. Magôlo, A., & Gimuguni, L. (2014). Effect of leadership styles on performance of local governments in Uganda. a case of Mbale district. *Political Science*. Retrieved from: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/>
- Obiwuru, T. C., Okwu, A. T, Akpa, V. O. & Nwankwere, I. A. (2011). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance: a survey of selected small scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu Council Development Area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*. 1 (7), 100-111.
- Omolayo, B. (2007). Effect of leadership style on job-related tension and psychological sense of community in work organizations: a case study of four organizations in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*, 4 (2), 1-8.
- Prerez, A. V., Milstein, M. M., Wood, C. J., & Jacquez, D. (1999). *How to turn a school around: What principals can do?* California, USA: Corwin Press Inc. Press.
- Quinlan, C. (2011). *Business Research Methods*. Hampshire, UK: Cengage Learning EMEA. Retrieved August, 2018, from <http://gbr.pepperdine.edu/042/leadership.html>
- Raja, A. S. & Palanichamy, P. (2011). Leadership styles and its impact on organizational commitment. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management Research and Innovation* 7(3):167-175: DOI: 10.1177/097324701100700315
- Richard A. E. (2015). A Review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3), 465–476.
- Ryan, J. & Tipu, S. A. A. (2013). Leadership effects on innovation propensity: A two-factor full range leadership model. *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (10), 2116-2129
- Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R. (2013). *Research Methods for Business*. 6th ed. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shcermerhorn, K. R., Hunt, J. G. & Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Organizational Behaviour*, 7th edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Stephen, E. G., Eke, I. E. & Cinjel, D. N. (2018). Management styles and organizational effectiveness: an appraisal of private enterprises in Northern Nigeria. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*, 40 (1), 37-49