

# **Evidence-Based Effect of Leadership Styles on Employee Job Performance in Nigerian Universities: Ebonyi State University In Perspective**

**LARRY E. UDU**

*PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIONM DEPARTMENT  
EBONYI STATE UNIVERSITY*

**JUDE C. OKEKE**

*NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIAN (NOUN)  
ABAKALIKI STUDY CENTRE.*

**MARTIN O.E. NWABA**

*DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
EBONYI STATE UNIVERSITY*

**IBENWO, GRACE**

*AKANU IBIAFIA FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC, UNWANA, AFIKPO.*

---

## **ABSTRACT**

The study examined effect of leadership styles on employee job performance in Nigerian Universities with particular attention to the Registry department of Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki. The study adopted questionnaire cross-sectional survey research of the interactions between three main factors of leadership styles; viz: The transactional, transformational and laissez-faire, respectively, and employee job performance. The study population was 145 drawn from senior administrative staff, heads of department and their subordinates. The simple percentage method was used to analyze data while the Ordinary Least squares (OLS) regression method was used for data analyses and hypotheses testing. Findings reveal that the overall response on employee job performance is high implying that staff of the department believe that the leadership styles are modest. Equally the leadership styles, contingent reward, inspirational motivation and idealized influences are quite satisfactory; the average perception Active Management by Exception, Passive Management by Exception Perception are modest but perceptions on intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, the laissez-faire leadership is deemed unsatisfactory. The study recommends improving the reward system of the institution in order to increase the level of satisfaction among the employees; and making the reward policy in such a way that it will compete favourably with those obtainable in sister universities. EBSU should consider staff motivation as a cardinal responsibility because, if staff motivation is not properly executed, institutions and their administrators will always suffer employees' negative attitude to work. On the whole, the study posit that there's main and interaction effect of inspirational leadership on employees' job performance in the institution.

**KEYWORDS:** Leadership styles, employee job performance, Ebonyi State University, Registry, Nigeria.

---

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Human Resource constitute the greatest asset in an organization. Management of the human resource therefore is critical to organizational growth and sustainability. Organizations therefore need to have capable leaders to lead and positively motivate the staff to achieve set goals. The style of leadership adopted by organization leaders would make or mar the achievement of organization goals. Three styles of leadership are of interest in this study; viz: the transactional, transformational and the laissez-faire leadership respectively.

Transactional leadership concerns itself with goal attainment and uses carrot and stick approach to achieve set goals (Bass, 1997). Transactional leadership is visionary wherein employees are motivated to exceed certain expectations. (Hater & Bass, 1998); Doucet, Fredette, Simard and Tremblay, 2015). Transformational leaders generate a greater involvement in subordinates works which result in higher efficiency and satisfaction and ultimately to managerial and organizational performance.

Laissez-faire leadership allows people and operations to develop without control. By setting no goals, avoiding mistakes, reluctance to take decisive actions, the employees becomes disinterested in their jobs, low morales and unproductive (Agbato, 1990). On the whole, leadership styles govern employee attitude towards their leaders, job performance and organizational productivity.

Generally, employee job performance may be seen as the outcome/output of employees vis-a-vis their job specifications. Such outcome or results of employee performance are so critical to the growth and sustainability of organizations that they should not be left to chances. Employee job performance according to Temple, 2002; Armstrong & Baron, 1998 and Amos, 2004), should be monitored and controlled for the desired results.

The University like any other organizations has goals and objectives. The Registry department, particularly those units that deal with processing and issuance of provisional admission letter to students, storage/retrieval of students' results and mobilization for the compulsory National Youths Service (NYSC) are critical to University mandate of teaching, graduating and, by extension, overall manpower development for the society.

The cardinal objective of this study is to examine the effect of leadership styles on employee job performance in Nigerian public Universities with particular attention to the registry of Ebonyi State University (EBSU). The indicators of employee job performance in the study area are highlighted in the proceeding paragraph.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Different leadership styles have diverse influences on employee job performance in organizations to different degrees, dimensions and intensity.

Leadership and organizational growth has attracted the interest of many scholars and researchers. Unfortunately, the outcome of research in these areas hardly influence organization leaders as many tend to adopt any leadership style that suits their individual personalities and idiosyncrasies; and, that is the problem.

In admissions department of Ebonyi State University, there have often been complaints of delayed processing/ release of admission list, some candidates are found to be offered admission into more than a single area of study while some others find their names in departments they never applied into. This tends to create delays in students' registration, cause avoidable stress, confusion and frustration to students.

The Examination/Records departments are charged with the responsibility of record-keeping of students' results, retrieval of results, computation and issuance of statement of results to graduands. Here, students have often complained of officials being absent from duty posts when their attentions are required; sometimes students' results, already seen at the academic departments are discovered missing at the records unit and much time are painstakingly exerted to reconcile such issues between department and Records – a situation that tends to mount pressures on the NYSC mobilization office and, ultimately, many graduands are not mobilized for the compulsory National Service (NYSC) timely.

This study aims to investigate the link (if any) between leadership styles and the foregoing problems in the study area.

### **Research Hypotheses**

- H1. The Transactional leadership influences admissions process in EBSU.
- H2. The Transformational leadership influences process/issuance of results statement to students in EBSU.
- H3. The Laissez-faire leadership has influence on graduands' mobilization for the NYSC in EBSU.

### **Leadership Styles and Employee Performance: Theoretical Explanations**

The study went eclectic in its theoretical anchorage due to the multiple variables involved. We commenced from the style and behavioural leadership theories to the Transactional as well as the Transformational theories considered relevant to the present study.

The styles and behavioural theory believes that a leader's behaviour and styles in which he relates to other people affects his effectiveness. Two leadership behaviour are identifiable: the first explores position-based influence of a leader or the use of authority. The second concentrates on the concern for people and productivity. In other words, rather than try to figure out what effective leaders were, researchers tried to determine what effective leaders did to motivate their subordinates, how they carried out their tasks and so on. Unlike traits, behaviour can be learned and therefore individuals trained in appropriate behaviour would be able to lead more effectively. Research showed nevertheless that leadership behaviours appropriate in one situation were not necessarily appropriate in another. Desirable leadership qualities and behaviours may also change. Nevertheless, despite evidence that effective leadership behaviour depends at least partially on the leader's situation. Some researchers have reached the conclusion that certain management behaviours are in fact more

effective than researchers have focused on two aspects of leadership behaviour; leadership functions and leadership styles (Stoner and Freeman, 1989 in Okeke, 2018).

The first aspect of the behaviour approach to leadership shifted the focus from individual leader to the functions that the leaders performed within their groups. It appeared that in order for group to operate effectively, someone had to perform two major functions; task related functions might include suggesting solutions. Group-maintenance functions may include anything that helps group operate more smoothly, agreeing with or complimenting another group member for people, or mediating group disagreements. An individual who is able to perform both roles successfully would obviously be an effective leader (Bales, 1951).

The second perspective on leadership behaviour focuses on one of the two styles that leaders use in dealing with subordinates; a task-oriented style and an employee-oriented style. Task-oriented manager closely supervise subordinates to ensure that the task is performed to their satisfaction; a manager with this leadership style is more concerned with getting the job done than in the development and growth of the subordinates. On the other hand, employee-oriented managers try to motivate rather than to control subordinates, they encourage group members to perform tasks by allowing members to participate in decisions that affect them and by performing friendly, trusting and respectful relationships with group members. Consequently, leaders are seen to apply three basic styles namely: autocratic, the democratic/participative and the laissez-faire styles of leadership.

The style theory acknowledges the significance of certain necessary leadership skills that serve as enabler for a leader who performs an act while drawing its parallel with previous capacity of the leader, prior to that particular act while suggesting that each individual has a distinct style of leadership with which he/she feels most contented. Like one that does not fit all heads, similarly one style cannot be effective in all situations. Yukl (1989) introduced three different leadership styles. The employees serving with democratic leaders displayed high degree of satisfaction, creativity and motivation; working with great enthusiasm and energy irrespective of the presence or absence of the leader; maintaining better connections with the leader, in terms of productivity whereas, autocratic leaders mainly focused on greater quantity of output. Laissez faire leadership was only considered relevant while leading a team of highly skilled and motivated people who has excellent track-record, in the past.

**Transactional Theory:** The leadership theories, by the late 1970s and early 1980s, activated to diverge from the specific perspectives of the leader, leadership context and the follower and toward practices that concentrated further on the exchanges between the followers and leaders. The transactional leadership was described as that in which leader-follower associations were grounded upon a series of agreements between followers and leaders (House and Shamir, 1993). The transactional theory was “based on reciprocity where leaders not only influence followers but are under their influence as well”. Some studies revealed that transactional leadership show a discrepancy with regard to the level of leaders’ action and the nature of the relations with the followers.

Bass and Avolio (1994) observed transactional leadership “as a type of contingent-reward leadership that had active and positive exchange between leaders and followers whereby followers are rewarded or recognized for accomplishing agreed upon objectives”. From the leader, these rewards might implicate gratitude for merit increases, bonuses and work achievement. For good work, positive support could be exchanged, merit pay for promotions, increased performance and operation for collegiality. The leaders could instead focus on errors, avoid responses and delay decisions. This attitude is stated as the “management-by-exception” and could be categorized as passive or active transactions. The difference between these two types of transactions is predicted on the timing of the leaders’ involvement. In the active form, the leader continuously monitors performance and attempts to intervene proactively (Avolio and Bass, 1997).

**Transformational Theory:** Transformational leadership distinguishes itself from the rest of the previous and contemporary theories, on the basis of its alignment to a greater good as it entails involvement of the followers in processes or activities related to personal factor towards the organization and a course that will yield certain superior social dividend. The transformational leaders raise the motivation and morality of both the follower and the leader (House and Shamir, 1993). It is considered that the transformational leaders “engage in interactions with followers based on common values, beliefs and goals”. This impacts the performance leading to the attainment of a goal. As per Bass, transformational leader, “attempts to induce follower to reorder their needs by transcending self-interests and strive for higher order needs”. This theory conforms with the Maslow (1954) higher order needs theory. Transformational leadership is a course that changes and approach targets on beliefs, values and attitudes that enlighten leaders’ practices and the capacity to lead change.

The literature suggests that followers and leaders should set aside personal interests for the benefit of the group. The leader is then asked to focus on followers’ needs and input in order to transform everyone into a leader by empowering and motivating them (House and Aditya, 1997). Emphasis is from the previously defined

leadership theories, the ethical extents of leadership further differentiates the transformational leadership. The transformational leaders are considered by their ability to identify the need for change, gain the agreement and commitment of others, create a vision that guides change and embed the change (MacGregor Bums, 2003). These types of leaders treat subordinates individually and pursue to develop their consciousness, morals and skills by providing significance to their work and challenge. These leaders produce an appearance of convincing and encouraged vision of the future. They are “visionary leaders who seek to appeal to their followers” better nature and move them toward higher and more universal needs and purposes” (Macgregor Bums, 2003).

### **Empirical Literature**

Empirical literature will be reviewed inline with the three main leadership styles identified in this study; ie: The Transactional, Transformational and the Laissez-faire leadership styles respectively.

Idemobi, Ngige and Ofili (2017) researched on effect of reward system on organizational performance which specific objectives were: to determine the effects of organisations reward system on workers' productivity, relationship between organisations reward system and workers attitude to work; relationship between organizations and reward system and job satisfaction and, relationship between reward system and workers' commitment. Data were collected through questionnaire and analyzed using chi-square statistical tool. Findings reveal that: organisations reward system has a significant effect on workers' productivity; there exist a significant relationship between organisations' reward system and workers' attitude to work; and there is relationship between organisations reward system and job satisfaction.

Similarly, studies by Victor and Hoole (2017); Korir, Isaac, Kipkobut and Dinah (2016) and Adeel, Khan, Zafar and RIzri (2018) confirm that there's relationship between reward and performance and passive leadership, organisational justice and affect-based trust.

On transformational leadership, Olusadum and Anulika (2018) studied the effect of motivation on employee performance in Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education. Methodology employed consist of questionnaire and chi-square analytical technique. Findings reveal a significant relationship between staff motivation and staff performance.

Other studies like Ghaffari, Shah, Burgogrie, Nazri and Salleh (2017); Ibrahim (2015) also confirm relationship between motivation and job performance of workers. Other studies on transformational leadership style include: Naeem and Khanzada (2018); Ndirangu (2018) and Malik, Javed and Hassan (2017).

Similarly, on the effects of intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration and idealized influence on job performance and employee satisfaction, studies such as Khalil, Zada, Tarig and Trshadullah (2018); Ogala, Sikalieh, Damory and Linge (2017); Ondari, Were and Rotich (2018); and, Ngaithie, K'Aol, Lewa and Ndaviga (2016) were in concensus in their results that the variables have significant relationship on output of workers in organisations.

On Laissez-Faire leadership, a number of studies like Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt and Van Engen (2003) reveal that exhibited frequent absence and lack of involvement during critical junctures negatively impact on organization performance generally.

Furthermore, Veliu, Manxhari, Demiri and Jahaj (2017), examined the different leadership styles and their effects on employee performance in Kosovo medium and large-size enterprises. Structured questionnaire was used for data collection while analyses were made through statistical package for social sciences. Result showed that leadership dimensions have both positive and negative influence on employee performance; specifically, charismatic, bureaucratic, laissez-faire and transactional style of leadership have negative effect on employee performance with ( $r=-0.228, -0.267, -0.336, -0.185: df=54; p<.001$ ). However, democratic, autocratic and transformational style of leadership had positive effective on employee performance with ( $r=0.213, 0.018$  and  $0.108: df=54; p<.001$ ).

Other works such as Nidaahavolu (2018) and Demesko (2017) also confirm the foregoing results.

## **II. Methodology**

The study is a survey. The Quasi-Experimental research design was adopted after critical look at the nature of the problems involved in the study.

The study population consists of three categories of staff; viz: Heads of department/units, Senior administrative staff and Junior/Subordinate staff totalling 145 workers from Admissions, Exams and Records departments and the NYSC mobilization office of the EBSU Registry. By means of convenience sampling, a total sample size of 120 was drawn from the population comprising 86 senior and 34 junior staff.

Primary data were collected by means of well-structured questionnaire. The Likert five-point scale was used to illicit responses from the respondents. To analyze percentage responses to items in the questionnaire, the options were grouped into three: (1) **Strongly Agree** and **Agree** simply means, **agreed** (2) **Disagree** and **Strongly Disagree** means, **Disagreed** and (3) **Neutral** remains **neutral**. The percentage responses are **Agreed**

or **Disagree** if the total percentage responses are 50% and above and neutral if otherwise. Thus, a mean value that is less than 3.00 is **disagreed**; a mean value of 3.00 is neutral while a mean value that is greater than 3.00 is **agreed**. Pilot tests and the test-retest techniques were used to determine instruments' validity and reliability.

Similarly, descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data collected while the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) Regression method was used for data analyses and testing of hypotheses.

### **Data Presentation and Analyses**

#### **Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

Gender: Male (69.2%) female (30.8%)

Marital Status: Single (20.8%) Married (79.2%)

Age: 21-29 (10.0%) 30 – 40 (45%) 41 and above (45%)

Educational qualification: FSLC (8%) O'level (40%) B.sc (51.7%) Postgraduate (7.5%)

Department/Unit: Admissions (35%) Exams and Records (40%) NYSC Mobilization (25%)

Rank/Position: Management level (6.7%) Senior staff (65%) Junior staff (28.3%)

Tenure in EBSU: 1-2 years (10.8%) 3-4 years (4.2%) 5-6 years (11.7%) Above 6 years (73.3%).

The summary of statistics and the cross-sectional analysis of the perceptions of research variables with respect to the demographics are presented in this section. The descriptive statistics show the summary of the data and other basic characteristics of the data as shown in Table I.

**Table I: Descriptive Statistics**

|                                 | Descriptive Statistics |                   |                   |                |                          |                    |            |                    |            |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
|                                 | N Statistic            | Minimum Statistic | Maximum Statistic | Mean Statistic | Std. Deviation Statistic | Skewness Statistic | Std. Error | Kurtosis Statistic | Std. Error |
| Employee Job Performance        | 120                    | 3.00              | 5.00              | 4.1550         | .37007                   | .333               | .221       | .086               | .438       |
| Contingent Reward               | 120                    | 2.40              | 5.00              | 4.1450         | .44906                   | -.682              | .221       | 2.344              | .438       |
| Active Management by Exception  | 120                    | 2.40              | 5.00              | 3.5983         | .65259                   | .195               | .221       | -.825              | .438       |
| Passive Management by Exception | 120                    | 1.40              | 4.80              | 3.0900         | .56142                   | -.009              | .221       | .835               | .438       |
| Inspirational Motivation        | 120                    | 2.00              | 5.00              | 4.0983         | .53953                   | -1.508             | .221       | 4.759              | .438       |
| Intellectual Stimulation        | 120                    | 1.60              | 5.00              | 3.8217         | .62162                   | -.820              | .221       | 1.729              | .438       |
| Individualized Consideration    | 120                    | 1.29              | 5.00              | 3.7464         | .53274                   | -.818              | .221       | 3.970              | .438       |
| Idealised Influence             | 120                    | 1.40              | 5.00              | 4.1417         | .48535                   | -2.236             | .221       | 13.626             | .438       |
| Laissez-Faire Leadership        | 120                    | 1.25              | 4.75              | 2.9063         | .67212                   | .131               | .221       | .290               | .438       |
| Valid N (listwise)              | 120                    |                   |                   |                |                          |                    |            |                    |            |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

In Table I, the mean of the employee job performance is 4.1550, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .37007 is low showed that employee job performance is high in the organisation. The minimum and maximum values are 3.00 and 5.00 respectively.

The mean value of Contingent Reward is 4.1450, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .44906 is low showed that contingent reward is good. The minimum and maximum values are 2.40 and 5.00 respectively.

The average Active Management by Exception perception of 3.5983, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .65259 is high showed that Active Management by Exception has been subject to criticism. The minimum and maximum values are 2.40 and 5.00 respectively.

The Passive Management by Exception perception of 3.0900 is moderate, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .56142 is high showed that it fluctuates widely with consequentially adverse effects on leadership. The minimum and maximum values are 1.40 and 4.80 respectively.

The Inspirational Motivation posted an impressive perception with a mean of 4.0983, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .53953 is high showed that Inspirational Motivation is a subject of controversy. The minimum and maximum values are 2.00 and 5.00 respectively.

The Intellectual Stimulation posted a perception with a mean of 3.8217, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .62162 is high showed that Intellectual Stimulation is deemed unsatisfactory. The minimum and maximum values are 1.60 and 5.00 respectively.

The Individualized Consideration posted a perception with a mean of 3.7464, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .53274 is high showed that Individualized Consideration is deemed unsatisfactory. The minimum and maximum values are 1.40 and 5.00 respectively.

The Idealised Influence posted an impressive perception with a mean of 4.1417, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .48535 is moderate showed that Idealised Influence is deemed satisfactory. The minimum and maximum values are 1.40 and 5.00 respectively.

The Laissez-Faire Leadership posted a perception with a mean of 2.9063, and also the fact that the standard deviation of the perception at .67212 is high showed that Laissez-Faire Leadership is deemed unsatisfactory. The minimum and maximum values are 1.25 and 4.75 respectively.

**Table 2: Cross-sectional analyses of the perceptions of research variables**

|                                   |        | Gender      | Marital Status | Age         | Educational Background | Department                         | Position in Org. | Tenure in Org.     |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Employee Job Performance          | F-test | .960(.529)  | 3.932(.050)    | 3.972(.021) | 7.093(.000)            | 1.531(.164)                        | 1.632(.200)      | 4.899(.003)        |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (3,2) (1)   |                        | (7,3,6,2,5,8,4)<br>(1,3,6,2,5,8,4) | (3,2,1)          | (4,3)<br>(3,2,1)   |
| Contingent Reward                 | F-test | 1.085(.300) | .169(.681)     | .139(.870)  | 6.356(.001)            | 2.029(.057)                        | .988(.375)       | .444(.722)         |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (1,3,2)     |                        | (4,3,2,6,5,8,7)<br>(1,2,6,5,8,7)   | (3,2,1)          | (4,1,3,2)          |
| Active Management by Exception    | F-test | .686(.409)  | 3.867(.052)    | 3.908(.023) | 2.352(.076)            | 1.415(.206)                        | 1.555(.216)      | 3.653(.015)        |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (2,3) (1)   |                        | (3,6,8,5,2,4,1,7)                  | (2,3,1)          | (4,3,1,2)          |
| Passive Management by Exception   | F-test | .755(.387)  | 1.127(.291)    | 1.299(.277) | 1.453(.231)            | 1.641(.131)                        | 1.579(.211)      | 2.265(.085)        |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (3,2,1)     |                        | (7,3,2,6,4)<br>(1,5,8,3,2,6,4)     | (1,2,3)          | (4,3,1,2)          |
| Inspirational Motivation          | F-test | .144(.705)  | 5.124(.025)    | 3.071(.050) | 2.327(.078)            | .813(.578)                         | .530(.590)       | 3.640(.015)        |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (3,2) (1)   |                        | (7,3,6,8,2,4,1,5)                  | (1,3,2)          | (4,3,1,2)          |
| Intellectual Stimulation          | F-test | .036(.849)  | .598(.441)     | .430(.652)  | 2.981(.034)            | .572(.777)                         | 1.596(.207)      | .387(.763)         |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (1,3,2)     |                        | (7,4,6,3,5,1,8,2)                  | (3,2,1)          | (1,4,2,3)          |
| Individualized Consideration      | F-test | 7.826(.006) | .041(.840)     | .006(.994)  | 1.348(.262)            | 2.822(.010)                        | .444(.643)       | 2.574(.057)        |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (2,3,1)     |                        | (6,3,5,8,4,2,7)<br>(2,7,1)         | (2,3,1)          | (2,4,1)<br>(4,1,3) |
| Idealised Influence               | F-test | 3.036(.084) | 2.024(.158)    | 1.477(.233) | 1.840(.144)            | .805(.585)                         | .052(.950)       | 2.461(.066)        |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (3,2,1)     |                        | (6,3,7,5,8,2,4,1)                  | (1,2,3)          | (4,1,2,3)          |
| Laissez-Faire Leadership          | F-test | .525(.470)  | 2.193(.141)    | 1.490(.230) | 2.110(.103)            | 1.454(.191)                        | 1.481(.232)      | 1.176(.322)        |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (3,1,2)     |                        | (7,3,2,4,6)<br>(3,2,4,6, 5,8,1)    | (1,2,3)          | (4,2,3,1)          |
| Adjusted Laissez-Faire Leadership | F-test | .652(.421)  | 1.641(.203)    | 1.336(.267) | 1.769(.157)            | 1.551(.158)                        | 1.540(.219)      | 1.689(.173)        |
|                                   | MCT    |             |                | (3,1,2)     |                        | (7,3,2,6,4)<br>(3,2,4,6, 5,1,8)    | (1,2,3)          | (4,3,2,1)          |
|                                   |        | Gender      | Marital Status | Age         | Educational Background | Department                         | Position in Org. | Tenure in Org.     |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

In Table 2, perceptions on employee job performance (EJP) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organisation, and tenure in organisation, but were same for gender, marital status and educational background. Perceptions on contingent rewards (CRW) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, and educational background. Perceptions on active management by exception (AME) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization, and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, educational background and tenure in organisation. Perceptions on passive management by exception (PME) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization, and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, educational background and tenure in organisation. Perceptions on inspirational motivation (INM) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization, and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, educational background and tenure in organisation. Perceptions on intellectual stimulation (ITS) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization, and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, educational background and tenure in organisation. Perceptions on individual consideration (IDC) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization, and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, educational background and tenure in organisation. Perceptions on idealized influence (IDI) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization, and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, educational background and tenure in organisation. Perceptions on Laissez Faire Leadership (LFL) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization,

and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, educational background and tenure in organisation. Perceptions on Adjusted Laissez Faire Leadership (LFL) were significantly different amongst age bracket, department, position in organization, and tenure in organization, but were same for gender, marital status, educational background and tenure in organisation.

**Table 3: Responses on employee job performance**

| S/N                         | Q/N | Statement  | SA       | A        | N        | D      | SD     | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------------|-----|--|----------|----------|----------|--------|--------|-------|----------------|
| <b><i>Extra Effort</i></b>  |     |  |          |          |          |        |        |       |                |
| 1.                          | 8   | Get others to do more than they expected to do               | 51(42.5) | 63(52.5) | 6(5.0)   |        |        | 4.375 | .5807          |
| 2.                          | 9   | Heighten others' desire to succeed                           | 43(35.8) | 69(57.5) | 8(6.7)   |        |        | 4.292 | .5855          |
| 3.                          | 10  | Increase others' willingness to try harder                   | 32(26.7) | 41(34.2) | 38(31.7) | 8(6.7) | 1(8)   | 3.792 | .9429          |
| <b><i>Effectiveness</i></b> |     |  |          |          |          |        |        |       |                |
| 4.                          | 11  | Am effective in meeting others' job-related needs            | 46(38.3) | 71(59.2) | 4(2.5)   |        |        | 4.358 | .5313          |
| 5.                          | 12  | Am effective in representing their group to higher authority | 39(32.5) | 72(60)   | 7(5.8)   | 2(1.7) |        | 4.233 | .6316          |
| 6.                          | 13  | Am effective in meeting organizational requirements          | 23(19.2) | 85(70.8) | 9(7.5)   | 2(1.7) | 1(8)   | 4.058 | .6390          |
| 7.                          | 14  | Lead a group that is effective                               | 23(19.2) | 90(75.0) | 6(5.0)   | 1(8.0) |        | 4.125 | .5114          |
| 8.                          | 15  | I usually execute defined duties                             | 28(23.3) | 78(65.0) | 13(10.8) |        | 1(8.0) | 4.100 | .6404          |
| 9.                          | 16  | I always meet deadlines                                      | 25(20.8) | 86(71.7) | 5(4.2)   | 3(2.5) | 1(8.0) | 4.092 | .6481          |
| 10.                         | 17  | I'm a team player and make inputs to management decisions    | 26(21.7) | 85(70.8) | 7(5.8)   | 2(1.7) |        | 4.125 | .5734          |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Over 60.9% of the respondents opine that: Get others to do more than they expected to do; Heighten others' desire to succeed; and Increase others' willingness to try harder.

Questions 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 15, 16 and 17 measured effectiveness. Over 88.3% of the respondents agree that: I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs; I am effective in representing their group to higher authority; I am effective in meeting organizational requirements; Lead a group that is effective; I usually execute defined duties; I always meet deadlines and I'm a team player and make inputs to management decisions.

**Table 4: Responses on transactional leadership**

| S/N  | Q/N | Statement   | SA       | A        | N        | D        | SD       | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|--|-----|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|----------------|
| <b><i>Contingent Reward</i></b>              |     |   |          |          |          |          |          |       |                |
| 1.   | 18  | My boss appreciates the quality of my efforts                             | 39(32.5) | 72(60)   | 7(5.8)   | 2(1.7)   |          | 4.233 | .6316          |
| 3.   | 19  | Discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving targets        | 23(19.2) | 85(70.8) | 9(7.5)   | 2(1.7)   | 1(8)     | 4.058 | .6390          |
| 4.   | 20  | Express satisfaction when others meet expectations                        | 30(25.0) | 84(70.0) | 3(2.5)   | 2(1.7)   | 1(8)     | 4.167 | .6262          |
| 5.   | 21  | Make clear what one can expect to receive when goals are achieved         | 1(8)     | 1(8)     | 7(5.8)   | 82(68.3) | 29(24.2) | 4.142 | .6257          |
| 6.   | 22  | When I perform a finished task well my supervisor acknowledges my efforts |          | 1(8)     | 6(5.0)   | 90(75.0) | 23(19.2) | 4.125 | .5114          |
| <b><i>Active management by exception</i></b> |     |   |          |          |          |          |          |       |                |
| 8.   | 23  | My boss is efficient in reaching organization's requirement               | 1(8)     |          | 13(10.8) | 78(65.0) | 28(23.3) | 4.100 | .6404          |
| 9.   | 24  | Focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations   | 3(25)    | 22(18.3) | 34(28.3) | 35(29.2) | 26(21.7) | 3.492 | 1.1000         |
| 10.  | 25  | Concentrate my attention on dealing with mistakes,                        | 18(15.0) | 39(32.5) | 33(27.5) | 30(25.0) |          | 3.375 | 1.0213         |

***Evidence-Based Effect Of Leadership Styles On Employee Job Performance In Nigerian ..***

|     |    |  |          |          |          |          |          |              |
|-----|----|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| 11. | 26 | complaints, failures<br>Keep track of all mistakes                 | 21(17.5) | 30(25.0) | 30(25.0) | 39(32.5) | 3.275    | 1.0998       |
| 12. | 27 | Direct my attention toward failures to meet standards              | 20(16.7) | 72(60.0) | 8(6.7)   | 18(15.0) | 2(1.7)   | 3.750 .9636  |
| 13. |    | <b><i>Passive Management by exception</i></b>                      |          |          |          |          |          |              |
| 14. | 28 | Fail to interfere until problems become serious                    | 8(6.7)   | 56(46.7) | 34(28.3) | 56(46.7) | 8(6.7)   | 2.650 1.0013 |
| 15. | 29 | Wait for things to go wrong before taking action                   | 7(5.8)   | 38(31.7) | 10(8.3)  | 56(46.7) | 9(7.5)   | 2.817 1.1375 |
| 16. | 30 | Show a firm belief in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"            | 3(2.5)   | 23(19.2) | 36(30.0) | 45(37.5) | 13(10.8) | 2.650 .9928  |
| 17. | 31 | Demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action | 12(10.0) | 61(50.8) | 30(25.0) | 10(8.3)  | 7(5.8)   | 3.508 .9873  |
| 18. | 32 | My boss can be relied upon when things get difficult at work       | 18(15.0) | 77(64.2) | 12(10.0) | 12(10.0) | 1(8.0)   | 3.825 .8368  |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Questions 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 are used to measure ***Contingent reward***. Over 90.0% of the respondents opine that: My boss appreciates the quality of my efforts; Discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving targets; Express satisfaction when others meet expectations. However, over 84.2% of the respondents disagree that: Make clear what one can expect to receive when goals are achieved; and When I perform a finished task well my supervisor acknowledges my efforts.

Questions 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 measured ***Active management by exception***. Over 88.3% of the respondents agree that: I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs; I am effective in representing their group to higher authority; I am effective in meeting organizational requirements; Lead a group that is effective; I usually execute defined duties; I always meet deadlines and I'm a team player and make inputs to management decisions. Also, 27.5% of the respondents opine that I Concentrate my attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures. However, 50.9% of the respondents disagree that My boss is efficient in reaching organization's requirements; Focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations

Questions 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 measured ***Passive Management by exception***. Over 53.4% of the respondents agree that: Fail to interfere until problems become serious; Demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action; My boss can be relied upon when things get difficult at work. Also, 30% of the respondents agree with "Show a firm belief in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it". However, 54.2% of the respondents disagree with "Wait for things to go wrong before taking action".

**Table 5: Responses on transformational leadership**

| S/N                                    | Q/N | Statement   | SA       | A        | N        | D        | SD       | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|--|-----|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|----------------|
| <b><i>Inspirational motivation</i></b> |     |   |          |          |          |          |          |       |                |
| 19.                                    | 33  | My boss promotes an atmosphere of team work                     | 30(25.0) | 77(64.2) | 5(4.2)   | 7(5.8)   | 1(.8)    | 4.067 | .7750          |
| 20.                                    | 34  | Talk optimistically about the future                            | 24(20.0) | 85(70.8) | 4(3.3)   | 3(2.5)   | 4(3.3)   | 4.017 | .7990          |
| 21.                                    | 35  | Talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished       | 32(26.7) | 83(69.2) | 2(1.7)   | 2(1.7)   | 1(.8)    | 4.192 | .6257          |
| 22.                                    | 36  | Articulate a compelling vision of the future                    | 25(20.8) | 86(71.7) | 5(4.2)   | 86(71.7) | 25(20.8) | 4.092 | .6481          |
| 23.                                    | 37  | Express confidence that goals will be achieved                  | 26(21.7) | 85(70.8) | 7(5.8)   | 2(1.7)   |          | 4.125 | .5734          |
| <b><i>Intellectual stimulation</i></b> |     |   |          |          |          |          |          |       |                |
| 24.                                    | 38  | Information on how to do my job comes from the work itself      | 19(15.8) | 71(59.2) | 19(15.8) | 9(7.5)   | 2(1.7)   | 3.800 | .8560          |
| 25.                                    | 39  | Re-examine critical assumptions to question whether appropriate | 24(20.0) | 68(56.7) | 19(15.8) | 6(5.0)   | 3(2.5)   | 3.867 | .8786          |
| 26.                                    | 40  | Seek differing perspectives when solving problems               | 13(10.8) | 71(59.2) | 22(18.3) | 8(6.7)   | 6(5.0)   | 3.642 | .9420          |
| 27.                                    | 41  | Get others to look at   | 18(15.0) | 72(60.0) | 17(14.2) | 7(5.8)   | 6(5.0)   | 3.742 | .9570          |

**Evidence-Based Effect Of Leadership Styles On Employee Job Performance In Nigerian ..**

|     |    |  |          |          |          |          |         |                    |
|-----|----|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|--------------------|
|     |    | problems from many different angles  |          |          |          |          |         |                    |
| 28. | 42 | Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments   | 23(19.2) | 86(71.7) | 8(6.7)   | 1(8)     | 2(1.7)  | <b>4.058</b> .6648 |
| 29. | 43 | <b>Individualized consideration</b><br>My boss gives me insightful suggestions on what I can do to Improve | 28(23.3) | 84(70.0) | 5(4.2)   |          | 3(2.5)  | <b>4.117</b> .7003 |
| 30. | 44 | My boss spends the time to teach and coach his subordinates  | 12(10.0) | 58(48.3) | 14(11.7) | 33(27.5) | 3(2.5)  | 3.358 1.0674       |
| 31. | 45 | I have the freedom to decide what I do on my job.  | 7(5.8)   | 42(35.0) | 24(20.0) | 36(30.0) | 11(9.2) | 2.983 1.1226       |
| 32. | 46 | Treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group                                      | 10(8.3)  | 64(53.3) | 17(14.2) | 20(16.7) | 9(7.5)  | 3.383 1.0938       |
| 33. | 47 | My manager is very concerned about the welfare of those under him/her                                      | 24(20.0) | 79(65.8) | 13(10.8) | 1(8)     | 3(2.5)  | 4.000 .7559        |
| 34. | 48 | Consider each individual as having different needs, abilities, aspirations                                 | 33(27.5) | 82(68.3) | 4(3.3)   |          | 1(8)    | 4.217 .5824        |
| 35. | 49 | Help others to develop their strengths   | 29(24.2) | 82(63.8) | 9(7.5)   |          |         | <b>4.167</b> .5397 |
| 36. | 50 | <b>Idealised influence</b><br>Talk about my most important values and beliefs                              | 18(15.0) | 93(77.5) | 6(5.0)   | 1(8)     | 2(1.7)  | <b>4.033</b> .6208 |
| 37. | 51 | Specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose   | 28(23.3) | 88(73.3) | 1(8)     | 1(8)     | 2(1.7)  | 4.158 .6351        |
| 38. | 52 | Consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions   | 31(25.8) | 86(71.7) | 1(8)     |          | 2(1.7)  | 4.200 .6163        |
| 39. | 53 | Emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission   | 22(18.3) | 89(74.2) | 7(5.8)   |          | 2(1.7)  | 4.075 .6239        |
| 40. | 54 | My co-workers are helpful to me in getting my job done   | 34(28.3) | 83(69.2) | 2(1.7)   |          | 1(8)    | <b>4.242</b> .5650 |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Questions 33, 34, 35, 36 and 37 are used to measure *Inspirational motivation*. Over 89.2% of the respondents opine that: My boss promotes an atmosphere of team work; Talk optimistically about the future; Talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished; Articulate a compelling vision of the future; Express confidence that goals will be achieved.

Questions 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42 measured *Intellectual stimulation*. Over 70.0% of the respondents agree that: Information on how to do my job comes from the work itself; Re-examine critical assumptions to question whether appropriate; Seek differing perspectives when solving problems; Get others to look at problems from many different angles; Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.

Questions 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49 measured *Individualized consideration*. Over 58.3% of the respondents agree that: My boss gives me insightful suggestions on what I can do to Improve; My boss spends the time to teach and coach his subordinates; I have the freedom to decide what I do on my job; Treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group; My manager is very concerned about the welfare of those under him/her; Consider each individual as having different needs, abilities, aspirations; Help others to develop their strengths.

Questions 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54 measured *Idealised influence*. Over 92.5% of the respondents agree that: Talk about my most important values and beliefs; Specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose; Consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions; Emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission; My co-workers are helpful to me in getting my job done.

**Table 6: Responses on laissez-faire leadership**

| S/N | Q/N | Statement  | SA       | A        | N        | D        | SD       | Mean                | Std. Deviation |
|-----|-----|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------------|----------------|
| 41. | 55  | Avoid getting involved when important issues arise | 8(6.7)   | 38(31.7) | 10(8.3)  | 56(46.7) | 8(6.7)   | <b>2.650</b> 1.0013 |                |
| 42. | 56  | Am absent when needed                              | 7(5.8)   | 38(31.7) | 10(8.3)  | 56(46.7) | 9(7.5)   | 2.817               | 1.1375         |
| 43. | 57  | Avoid making decisions                             | 3(2.5)   | 23(19.2) | 36(30.0) | 45(37.5) | 13(10.8) | 2.650               | .9928          |
| 44. | 58  | Delay responding to urgent questions               | 12(10.0) | 61(50.8) | 30(25.0) | 10(8.3)  | 7(5.8)   | <b>3.508</b> .9873  |                |

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Questions 55, 56, 57 and 58 are used to measure laissez-faire leadership. 60.8% of the respondents agree that there is “Delay in responding to urgent questions”. Also, 30% of the respondents opine “Avoid making decisions”. However, over 54.2% of the respondents disagree that: Avoid getting involved when important issues arise; I am absent when needed.

### **Analyses of the Research Hypotheses**

Before analysing the data by regression analysis, we test for the assumptions of regression analysis ordinary least square (OLS) method. We conduct a diagnostic test to confirm that the assumptions of OLS are not violated in the model. We also show that there is no multi-collinearity in the data set using Bryman and Cramer (1997) and Dwivedi (2008) standards, by examining the regression coefficients.

### **Correlation Analyses**

Table 7 shows the correlation matrix of the study variables. This is discussed below.

**Table 7: Correlation Matrix**

| Correlations                                      |  | EMPLOYEE<br>JOB<br>PERFORMA<br>NCE | CONTIG<br>ENT<br>REWAR<br>D | ACTIVE<br>MANAGEM<br>ENT BY<br>EXCEPTIO<br>N | PASSIVE<br>MANAGEM<br>ENT BY<br>EXCEPTIO<br>N | INSPIRATIO<br>NAL<br>MOTIVATIO<br>N | INTELLECT<br>UAL<br>STIMULATI<br>ON | INDIVIDUAL<br>IZED<br>CONSIDERA<br>TION | IDEALIS<br>ED<br>INFLUENCE<br>NCE | LAISSEZ-<br>FAIRE<br>LEADERS<br>HIP |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| EMPLOYEE<br>JOB<br>PERFORMA<br>NCE                | Pearson<br>Correlat<br>ion<br>Sig. (2-<br>tailed)<br>N | 1                                  | .779**                      | .599**                                       | -.062   | .646**                              | .480**                              | .521**                                  | .579**                            | -.120                               |
| CONTIGENT<br>REWARD<br>N                          | Pearson<br>Correlat<br>ion<br>Sig. (2-<br>tailed)<br>N |                                    | 1                           | .409**                                       | .102  | .512**                              | .549**                              | .567**                                  | .579**                            | .055                                |
| ACTIVE<br>MANAGEME<br>NT<br>BY<br>EXCEPTION<br>N  | Pearson<br>Correlat<br>ion<br>Sig. (2-<br>tailed)<br>N |                                    |                             | 1  | -.213*  | .313**                              | .301**                              | .499**                                  | .346**                            | -.268**                             |
| PASSIVE<br>MANAGEME<br>NT<br>BY<br>EXCEPTION<br>N | Pearson<br>Correlat<br>ion<br>Sig. (2-<br>tailed)<br>N |                                    |                             |  | 1   | .019                                | .001                                | .001                                    | .000                              | .003                                |
| INSPIRATIO<br>NAL<br>MOTIVATIO<br>N               | Correlat<br>ion<br>Sig. (2-<br>tailed)<br>N            |                                    |                             |  |   | 1                                   | .174                                | .858                                    | .870                              | .971                                |
| INTELLECTU<br>AL<br>STIMULATIO<br>N               | Correlat<br>ion<br>Sig. (2-<br>tailed)<br>N            |                                    |                             |  |   |                                     | 1                                   | .120                                    | .120                              | .120                                |
| INDIVIDUAL<br>IZED<br>CONSIDERA<br>TION           | Correlat<br>ion<br>Sig. (2-<br>tailed)<br>N            |                                    |                             |  |   |                                     |                                     | 1                                       | .721**                            | .120                                |
| IDEALISED<br>INFLUENCE<br>N                       | Correlat<br>ion<br>Sig. (2-<br>tailed)<br>N            |                                    |                             |  |   |                                     |                                     |   | 1                                 | -.028                               |

### Evidence-Based Effect Of Leadership Styles On Employee Job Performance In Nigerian ..

|                          |                     |       |      |         |        |      |       |       |       |     |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-------|------|---------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP | Pearson Correlation | -.120 | .055 | -.268** | .955** | .056 | -.044 | -.028 | -.036 | 1   |
|                          | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .191  | .550 | .003    | .000   | .545 | .630  | .765  | .694  |     |
|                          | N                   | 120   | 120  | 120     | 120    | 120  | 120   | 120   | 120   | 120 |

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

The Pearson's correlation coefficients show a significant relationship between employee job performance and other constructs except for passive management by exception and idealized influence. Bryman and Cramer (1997) postulate that the Pearson's correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) should not exceed .80; otherwise the independent variables that show a relationship in excess of .80 may be suspected of having multi-collinearity. In the same vein, Dwivedi (2008) posits that a correlation coefficient of .90 among variables would suggest the existence of multi-collinearity. We observed, however, from Table 7 that none of the correlation coefficients is up to .80, thus ruling out any form of multi-collinearity in our model. Also, we see that all the variables correlated positively with EJP except for passive management by exception and idealized influence.

### Regression Analyses

In this section, the researchers performed a regression analysis of employee job performance in Ebonyi State University Registry department and antecedents' variables. It details a discussion of the regression coefficients estimates and the regression diagnostics tests. The diagnostic tests include: the analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests, Durbin-Watson Statistics, and collinearity statistics. The Durbin-Watson statistics is a test of the relationship between the variable outcomes in repeated sampling. Also, the coefficient of multiple determinations, which indicates the amount of variation in the model explained by the regression model, is investigated. Table 8 show the model summary.

**Table 8: Model Summary**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |          |     |     |               | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|---------------|
|       |                   |          |                   |                            | R Square Change   | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |               |
| 1     | .882 <sup>a</sup> | .778     | .762              | .18058                     | .778              | 48.599   | 8   | 111 | .000          | 2.002         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), ADJUSTED LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP, INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION, INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION, ACTIVE MANAGEMENT BY EXCEPTION, INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION, CONTIGENT REWARD, IDEALISED INFLUENCE, LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP  
b. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE JOB PERFORMANCE

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Table 8 returns a DW value of 2.002 which is within the bench mark of  $1.5 < DW < 2.5$ , which means that the data does not suffer from the problem of serial correlation (also termed auto-correlation). From Table 7, it is observed that the  $R^2 = 0.778$  and its adjusted value of 0.762 which are the indicators of overall goodness of fit are satisfactory. This indicates a good fit of data to the model; i.e., we can make forecast from the model.

In terms of the overall performance of the model, the  $R^2$  which is an indication of the goodness of fit of the model at 0.778 is statistically significant. This means that for the period under study and based on the available data, CRW, AME, INM, ITS, IDC, IDI, LFL and ALFL accounted for 77.8% of the total variations in the employee job performance in the organisation, while 22.7% can be said to be due to other variables that are not captured by the study. This result is further supported by the adjusted  $R^2$  value of 0.762 is also statistically significant, which indicates that after taking into account the number of repressors, the model explains about 76.2% of the changes in employee job performance.

Another requirement for the use of regression for modelling is that the variables must be linearly related. We test that using the F-test in Table 9 below.

**Table 9: Analysis of Variance**

| ANOVA <sup>a</sup> |            | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---|------|
| Model              | Regression |                |     |             |   |      |
|                    | Residual   | 3.619          | 111 | .033        |   |      |
|                    | Total      | 16.297         | 119 |             |   |      |

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE JOB PERFORMANCE  
b. Predictors: (Constant), ADJUSTED LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP, INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION, INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION, ACTIVE MANAGEMENT BY EXCEPTION, INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION, CONTIGENT REWARD, IDEALISED INFLUENCE, LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Table 9 shows that variables in the model are linearly related since the F-statistics of 48.599 is less than the critical value bounds (sig. = .000). In other word, we cannot reject the null hypothesis of no co-integration among the variables in the study. When these variables are co-integrated, the estimation of the model with the variables will produce reliable results (Green, 2008). Thus, the statistics in Table 4 indicate that we can use regression to forecast the relationships among the variables. We can thus proceed to examine the regression results from the OLS model.

### **The OLS Model**

The examination of results from the regression equation is based on the ordinary least square (OLS) model. Table 10 shows the results from the ordinary least square method.

**Table 10: The Result of the OLS Model**

| Model                             | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients<br>Beta | T      | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics |        |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|--------|------|-------------------------|--------|
|                                   | B                           | Std. Error |                                   |        |      | Tolerance               | VIF    |
| (Constant)                        | 1.093                       | .194       |                                   | 5.647  | .000 |                         |        |
| CONTIGENT REWARD                  | .440                        | .051       | .534                              | 8.558  | .000 | .514                    | 1.947  |
| ACTIVE MANAGEMENT BY EXCEPTION    | .163                        | .032       | .288                              | 5.103  | .000 | .628                    | 1.591  |
| INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION          | .201                        | .040       | .293                              | 5.044  | .000 | .594                    | 1.683  |
| INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION          | -.033                       | .037       | -.056                             | -.914  | .363 | .530                    | 1.887  |
| INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION      | -.058                       | .052       | -.083                             | -1.118 | .266 | .364                    | 2.748  |
| IDEALISED INFLUENCE               | .082                        | .056       | .108                              | 1.467  | .145 | .373                    | 2.684  |
| LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP          | .002                        | .166       | .004                              | .014   | .989 | .022                    | 45.645 |
| ADJUSTED LAISSEZ-FAIRE LEADERSHIP | -.058                       | .185       | -.095                             | -.316  | .753 | .022                    | 45.485 |

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE JOB PERFORMANCE

**Source: Field Survey, 2019.**

Table 10 shows that for three of the explanatory variables, the regression coefficients CRW ( $B = .440$ ,  $T = 8.558$ ,  $\text{sig} = .000$ ), AME ( $B = .163$ ,  $T = 5.103$ ,  $\text{sig} = .000$ ), INM ( $B = .201$ ,  $T = 5.044$ ,  $\text{sig} = .000$ ) are statistically significant and all also have signs that are in line with a priori expectations. However, INS ( $B = -.033$ ,  $T = -.914$ ,  $\text{sig} = .363$ ), IDC ( $B = -.058$ ,  $T = -1.118$ ,  $\text{sig} = .266$ ), IDI ( $B = .082$ ,  $T = 1.467$ ,  $\text{sig} = .145$ ), LFL ( $B = .002$ ,  $T = .014$ ,  $\text{sig} = .989$ ), and ALFL ( $B = -.058$ ,  $T = -.316$ ,  $\text{sig} = .753$ ). The regression results conform to the a priori expectations as we have in the OLS model.

### **Testing Hypotheses**

The study has empirically verified and discussed the factors determining employee job performance. This section focuses on the hypothesis testing of the data collected through survey research. The analyses of the data provide the bases for the rejection or the acceptance of the hypothesis formulated. The hypothesis formulated were tested using regression analysis also called coefficient determinant to know cause and effects relationship between the variables.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** The transactional leadership influences admission process in EBSU.

Findings from the study on Hypothesis One revealed that Contingent reward ( $B = .440$ ,  $T = 8.558$ ,  $\text{sig} = .000$ ), Active Management by Exception ( $B = .163$ ,  $T = 5.103$ ,  $\text{sig} = .000$ ) has significant relationship with employee job performance. The findings of the study are quite far reaching especially in relation with the hypotheses of the study. The study indicates that leadership styles is positively related to contingent reward such that unit increase in contingent reward will lead to increase in employee job performance by 0.440. For active management by exception, the study indicates that a unit increase in active management by exception by 0.163. This study shows that increase in active management by exception would lead to improvement in the employee job performance.

This result agreed with earlier findings by Idemobi, Ngige and Ofili (2017). Also, Ibrar and Khan (2015) revealed that there is positive relationship between rewards (extrinsic and intrinsic) and employee's job performance. Most of the organizations implement rewards system to increase the job performance and job satisfaction. The study recommended improving the reward system of organizations so as to increase the level of satisfaction among employees; and making the reward policy of the organization in such a way that it will compete favorably with those of other organizations in the industry.

**H<sub>o2</sub>:**The transformational leadership influences processing/issuance of statement of Results to Students in EBSU.

The test for Hypothesis Two of this study revealed that Inspirational motivation ( $B = .201$ ,  $T = 5.044$ ,  $sig. = .000$ ) are statistically significant and all also have signs that are in line with a priori expectations. This means that a unit increase in inspirational motivation will lead to .201 improvement in employee job performance. Olusadum and Anulika (2018); Ghaffari, Shah, Burgoyne, Nazri and Salleh (2017); Waiyaki (2017) and Ibrahim (2015), found significant relationship between staff motivation and staff performance. Therefore, organizations should consider staff motivation as a cardinal responsibility, unless staff motivation is properly executed, organizations and their managers will always suffer employees' negative attitude to work. The studies showed that the most significant motivational factor for job performance was responsibility, while fringe benefits were the second significant factor. Findings from the study suggest that leadership opportunities, recognition and employee appraisal, meeting employee expectations and socialization are the key factors that motivate employees.

However, Intellectual stimulation ( $B = -.033$ ,  $T = -.914$ ,  $sig. = .363$ ), Individualized consideration ( $B = -.058$ ,  $T = -1.118$ ,  $sig = .266$ ), Idealised influence ( $B = .082$ ,  $T = 1.467$ ,  $sig = .145$ ) do not significantly influence employee job performance.

**H<sub>o3</sub>:**The laissez-faire leadership has influence on graduands' mobilization for the NYSC in EBSU.

Some studies have associated passive management by exception to laissez-faire leadership. Adeel, Khan, Zafar and Rizvi, (2018)'s study revealed that the passive leadership is negatively associated with the affect-based trust and perceptions of organizational justice and the mediating role of affect-based trust is also confirmed between these relationships. The delays, frustration of graduands and related internal as well as external bottlenecks experienced by graduands in their efforts to timely get mobilized for the compulsory National Youth Service (NYSC) in EBSU are attributable to lack of proactive actions in tackling issues by officials of this department. Resultantly, many graduands fail to get mobilized as at and when due.

### **III. Summary/Findings**

- The study revealed that: contingent reward and Active Management by Exception have significant relationship with employee job performance in admission unit of EBSU; indicating that transactional leadership style is positively related to contingent reward such that unit increase in contingent reward will lead to increase in employee job performance.
- Inspirational motivation is statistically significant and equally has signs that are inline with a priori expectation; implying that a unit increase in inspirational motivation occasioned by transformational leadership style, will lead to improvement in employee job performance in the Exams/Record department of EBSU.
- Passive leadership (Laissez-faire) style is negatively associated with the affect-based trust and perceptions of organizational justice and the medialing role of affect-based trust is also confirmed between these relationships.

### **IV. Conclusion/Recommendation**

The cardinal objective of the study is to determine the effect of leadership styles on employee job performance in Registry department of Ebonyi State University. There is a consensus among scholars/researchers that leadership styles could have differential effects on employees of organisations.

Our study has made a significant contribution in existing body of information about the association between perception of leadership styles and employee job satisfaction and overall performance. There was a strong association between contingent reward and employee job performance; there is a positive effect between perception of active management by exception and employee job performance. The study can safely conclude from available data/tests that the main interaction effect of inspirational leadership on employee job satisfaction was significant indicating that inspiring leaders are likely to guarantee higher performance in organisations. Equally, the fact that the main interaction effect of contingent reward policy on employee job performance was significant shows that employee tend to be more committed to their jobs when they are adequately rewarded and when leaders are highly inspirational. Thus, there is a general effect of leadership styles on employee job performance in organisations.

The study therefore, recommends as follows:

- There should be improvement in the reward system of EBSU Staff in such a way that such reward policy can favourably compete with those obtainable in sister institutions;
- To avoid bad attitude to work, organization leaders should give motivation of their staff the priority it deserves; and
- Leadership opportunities, recognition and employee appraisal and promotion as at and when due as well as meeting employee expectations and socialization are key factors that motivate employees.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Abd-Elrhaman, Ebtesam Saeed Ahmed and Abd-Allah, Nora Ahmed (2018). Transformational leadership educational program for head nurses and its effect on nurses' job performance. *American Journal of Nursing Science*, 7(4), 127-136.
- [2]. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in Social Exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- [3]. Adebayo, A. (1989). *Principles and practice of public administration in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Book Ltd.
- [4]. Adeel, Muhammad Majid, Khan, Hafiz Ghulran Ali, Zafar, Naveed and Rizvi, Syed Tahir (2018). Passive leadership and its relationship with organizational justice: Verifying mediating role of affect-based trust. *Journal of Management Development*, 37(2), 212-223.
- [5]. Ademolekun, I. (1988). *Politics and Administration in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- [6]. Agbato, J. O. (1990). *The nature of management for advanced students*. Ibadan: University Press.
- [7]. Agbato, J. O. (1990). The nature of management, Lagos: Central Bank Publication.
- [8]. Agyemang, Franklin Gyamfi, Boateng, Henry and Dzandu, Michael Dzigbordi (2017). Examining intellectual stimulation, idealised influence and individualised consideration as an antecedent to knowledge sharing: Evidence from Ghana. *Knowledge Management and E-Learning*, 9(4), 484-498.
- [9]. Anyango, Celestine Awino (2015). Effects of leadership styles on employee performance at Bank of Africa Kenya Limited. Unpublished Masters of Human Resources Management Thesis, The Open University of Tanzania.
- [10]. Armstrong, M. and Baron, A. (1998). *Performance Management Handbook*, IPM, London.
- [11]. Ary Jacob, L.C. and Razavich, A. *Introduction to Research in Education* (1972). New York and Winston Inc.
- [12]. Aunjum, Adeel Hussain, Abbas, Ghulam, and Sajid, Muhammad (2017). Transformational leadership and employee motivation in Banking Sector of Pakistan. *Advances in Economics and Business* 5(9), 487-494.
- [13]. Avolio, B. J. (1999). Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [14]. Avolio, B. J. and Bass, B. M. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership, California: Sage.
- [15]. Bales, R. F. (1950). Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- [16]. Barbuto, J. E. (1997). Taking the charisma out of transformational leadership. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12 (3), 689-690.
- [17]. Baridam, D.M., Research Methods in Administrative Sciences (2001). Third edition, Sherbrooke Associates, Port- Harcourt.
- [18]. Bartlett, C. A. and Ghoshal, S. (1995). *Changing the Role of Top Management: Beyond Systems to People*. Harvard Business Review. Reprint 95301.
- [19]. Basit, Abdul, Sebastian, Veronica and Hassan, Zubair (2017). Impact of leadership style on employee performance (A case study on a private organization in Malaysia). *International Journal of Accounting and Business Management* 5 (2).
- [20]. Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership psychology and organizational behavior*. New York: Macmillan publishers En.
- [21]. Bass, B. M. (1960). Leadership psychology and organizational behavior, New York: Harper.
- [22]. Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organisational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52 (2), 130-139
- [23]. Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press, New York.
- [24]. Bhagat, R. S. and Steers R. M. (2009). *Cambridge handbook of culture, organizations, and work*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- [25]. Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H.H., Harvey, J., and LePine, J. A. (2015) "Well, I'm tired of tryin'!" Organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 56-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037583>
- [26]. Bommer, W., Rubin, R. and Baldwin, T. (2004). Setting the stage for effective leadership: Antecedents of transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15 (2), 195-210
- [27]. Bronkhorst, B., Steijn, B. and Vermeeren, B. (2015). Transformational leadership, goal setting, and work motivation: The case of a Dutch municipality. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 35 (2), 124-145
- [28]. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper Torchbooks, New York.
- [29]. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H. and Sager, C. E. (1993). A Theory of Performance. In: Schmitt, N. and Borman, W. C., Eds., *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 3570.
- [30]. Chang, Heidi (2017). Does leadership matter? study of leadership style, job performance and job satisfaction. *PoslovnaEkonomija Business Economics GodinaXIBroj 2*, Str 1 – 28. doi: 10.5937/poseko12-16191.
- [31]. Chemers, M. (1985). The organization and culture of effective leadership, Englewood Cliff: N.J. Prentice Hall.
- [32]. Cherrington, D. J. (1994). *Organisational Behavior*. Baston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [33]. Collis, D. J. and Montgomery, C. A. (1995). Competing on Resources. *Harvard Business Review*; 73 (4), 118-128.
- [34]. Cummings, L. L. and Schwab, D. P. (1973). *Performance in Organization: Determinants and Appraisal*, Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- [35]. Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., and Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 580-590.
- [36]. Demeško, Natalija (2017). *Effects of transformational and transactional leadership styles on innovative work behavior: The role of employee's locus of control*. Unpublished Master of Innovation and Technology Management Thesis, ISM University of Management and Economics.
- [37]. Doucet, O., Fredette, M., Simard, G. and Tremblay, M. (2015). Leader profiles and their effectiveness on employees' outcomes. *Human Performance*, 28 (3), 244-264
- [38]. Eagly, A. H., Johannessen-Schmidt, M. C. and van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire leadership styles: A Meta-Analysis comparing Women and Men. *Psychological Bulletin* 2003, 129 (4), 569-591.
- [39]. Ejiofor, P. (1987). Management in Nigeria, theories and issues, Onitsha: Africana FEP.
- [40]. El Toufaili, Bilal (2017). *The effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance - A theoretical approach*. Proceedings of the 11th International Management Conference "The Role of Management in the Economic Paradigm of the XXIst Century", Bucharest, Romania.
- [41]. Epitropaki, O. and Martin, T. (2005). The moderating role of individual differences in the relation between transformational/transactional leadership perceptions and organizational identification. *Leadership Quarterly Journal*, 16 (4), 569-589.
- [42]. Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [43]. Foot, M. and Hook, C. (1999). *Introducing Human Resources Management*: Longman.
- [44]. Gagne, M., and Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 331-362.

- [45]. Ghaffari, Sara, Shah, Ishak Mad, Burgoyne, John, Nazri, Mohammad and Salleh, Jalal Rezk (2017). The influence of motivation on job performance: A case study at universititeknologi Malaysia. *Aust. J. Basic and Appl. Sci.*, 11(4): 92-99.
- [46]. Ha, Nguyen Minh and Nguyen, Tran Viet Hoang (2014). The influence of leadership behaviors on employee performance in the context of software companies in Vietnam. *Advances in Management and Applied Economics*, 4 (3), 157-171.
- [47]. Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. (1997). Transactional versus Transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 70 (1), 19-35.
- [48]. Hater, J. J. and Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73 (4), 695-702.
- [49]. Helriegel, D. and Slocum, J. (2006). *Organizational Behavior* (11<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Mason, OH: South Western.
- [50]. Hendry, C. (1995). Human Resource Management: A strategy approach to employment. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- [51]. House, J.R. (1971). A Path-Goal Theory of Leadership Effectiveness: *Administrative Science Quarterly*; 16 (3), 321-339.
- [52]. Ibrahim, M. (2015). Impact of Motivation on Employee Performance: The case of some selected micro finance companies in Ghana. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management, United Kingdom* 3(11), ISSN 2348 0386, <http://ijecm.co.uk/>
- [53]. Ibrar, Muhammad and Khan, Owais (2015). The impact of reward on employee performance (A case study of Malakand Private School). *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences* 52, 95-103.
- [54]. Idemobi, Ellis, Ngige, Chigbe, Donatus, Ofili, Peter Nkeonyeasoa (2017). Relationship Between Organization Reward System and Workers Attitude to Work. *Journal of Business and Economic Development*, 2(4), 247-254.
- [55]. Iwu, E. A. (1999). Leadership and Organizational Theories: Memo of Department of Business Administration UNN.
- [56]. Jiang, Weiping, Zhao, Xianbo and Ni, Jiongbin (2017). *The impact of transformational leadership on employee sustainable performance: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior*. Sustainability, 9, 1567; doi:10.3390/su9091567
- [57]. Jyoti, J. and Bhau, S. (2015). Impact of transformational leadership on job performance. *SAGE Opening*, 5 (4), 2158244015612518
- [58]. Jyoti, Jeevan and Dev, Manisha (2015). The impact of transformational leadership on employee creativity: The role of learning orientation. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 9 (1), 78 – 98.
- [59]. Kala'lembang, Adriani, Soetjipto, Budi Eko and Sutrisno (2015). The effect of transformational leadership and organizational culture on employee's working performance through organizational commitment. *IJA B E R*, 13 (7), 5305-5322.
- [60]. Kaplan and Norton (1998). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*. Boston; Harvard Business School Press.
- [61]. Khalil, Syed Haider and Sahibzadah, Shehnaz (2017). Leaders' individualized consideration and employees' job satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Tourism* 3 (2), July – December.
- [62]. Khalil, Syed Haider, Zada, Shehnaz Sahib, Tariq, Muhammad and Irshadullah, Muhammad (2018). Impact of intellectual stimulation on employees' job satisfaction. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 6 (2).
- [63]. Khan, Irfanullah and Nawaz, Allah (2017). The leadership styles and the employee's performance: A review. *Gomal University Journal of Research [GUJR]32* (2).
- [64]. Kim, S. and Yoon, G. (2015). An Innovation-Driven Culture in Local Government: Do senior managers' transformational leadership and the climate for creativity matter? *Public Personnel Management*, 44 (2), 147-168
- [65]. Korir, Isaac and Kipkебut, Dinah (2016). The effect of reward management on employee's commitment in the universities in Nakuru County-Kenya. *Journal of Human Resource Management*. 4 (4), 37-48.
- [66]. Kuchinke, K. P. (2016). Impact of leadership styles on employees' attitude towards their leader and performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistani Banks, 54-64.
- [67]. Kuchinke, K. P. (1998). The influence of leadership styles on subordinates' attitudes towards their leaders and towards performance: A comparison of US and German manufacturing employees. *Human Resource Development International*, 1 (3), 291-308.
- [68]. Lor, W. and Hassan, Z. (2017). The influence of leadership on employee performance among jewellery artisans in Malaysia. *International Journal of Accounting and Business Management* 5 (1), 14-33.
- [69]. Malcalm, E. and Tamatey, S. (2017). Examining leadership style on employee performance in the public sector of Ghana (A case of Ghana Atomic Energy Commission). *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 7(11), 2250-3153.
- [70]. Malik, Waqas Umer, Javed, Muqaddas and Hassan, Syed Taimoor (2017). Influence of transformational leadership components on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*. 11 (1), 146-165.
- [71]. Mehmood, Anum (2016). Transactional leadership style and its effect on organizational commitment: Employee trust as a mediator. *Sci. Int. (Lahore)*,28(5),57-64.
- [72]. Naeem, S. and Khanzada, B. (2018). Role of transformational leadership in employee's performance with mediating role of job satisfaction in health sector of Pakistan. *J Health Educ Res Dev*, 6 (1), 104172/2380-5439.1000245.
- [73]. Naim, N., Raed, A. and Yun, K. B. (2012). The impact of transformational leadership style on innovation as perceived by public employees in Jordan. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 22 (3), 182-201.
- [74]. Ndirangu, Jacqueline W. (2018). *Influence of transformational leadership on employee performance: A case study of local non-governmental organizations in Kenya*. Unpublished Master of Science in Organizational Development (MOD) Thesis, United States International University – Africa.
- [75]. Newland, A., Newton, M., Podlog, L., Legg, W. E. and Tanner, P. (2015). Exploring the nature of transformational leadership in sports: A phenomenological examination with female athletes. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 7 (5), 663-687
- [76]. Ngaithe, L., K'Aol, G., Lewa, P. and Ndwiga, M. (2016). Effect of idealized influence and inspirational motivation on staff performance in state owned enterprises in Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Management* 8 (30).
- [77]. Ngaithe, L., K'Aol, G., Lewa, P. and Ndwiga, M. (2016). Effect of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration on staff performance in state owned enterprises in Kenya. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 6 (20).
- [78]. Nidadhavolu, A. (2018). *Impact of leadership styles on employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment – A study in the construction sector in India*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, *Western Kentucky University*, Bowling Green, Kentucky.
- [79]. Nwosu, H. N. (1977). Political Authority and the Nigerian Civil Service, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- [80]. Odunlami, S. A., Awosusi, O. O. and Awolusi, O. D. (2017). The influence of leadership styles on employees' performance: A Study of Selected Private Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. *G.J.C.M.P.*, 6(2), 5-13.
- [81]. Ogola, M. G., Ogutu, S. D. and Linge, T. K. (2017). The influence of idealized influence leadership behavior on employee performance in small and medium enterprises in Kenya. *European International Journal of Science and Technology*. <https://ejist.org.uk>
- [82]. Ogola, M. G., Ogutu, S. D. and Linge, T. K. (2017). The Influence of Intellectual Stimulation Leadership Behaviour on Employee Performance in SMEs in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. <https://www.ijbssnet.com>

- [83]. Olusadum, N. J. and Anulika, N. J. (2018). Impact of Motivation on Employee Performance: A Study of AlvanIkoku Federal College of Education. *Journal of Management and Strategy*. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jms.v9n1p53>
- [84]. Ondari, J. N., Were, S. and Rotich, G. (2018). Effect of individualized consideration on organisational performance of state corporations in Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management*, 5 (1), 210 - 246.
- [85]. Orabi, Tareq Ghaleb Abu (2016). The impact of transformational leadership style on organizational performance: Evidence from Jordan. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies* 6(2).
- [86]. Osabiya, B. (2015). The Impact of Leadership Style on Employee's Performance in an Organization. *Public Policy and Administration Research* 5 (1).
- [87]. Paago, B.U. (1982). Essentials of management principles and practice
- [88]. Packard, S. H. and Kauppi, D. R. (1999). Rehabilitation agency leadership style: Impact on subordinates' job satisfaction. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 43 (1), 5-11
- [89]. Paracha, M. Umer, Qamar, Adnan, Mirza, Anam and Waqas, Inam-ul-Hassan (2012). Impact of leadership style (transformational and transactional leadership) on employee performance & mediating role of job satisfaction: Study of private school (educator) in Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research* 12 (4) Version 1.0.
- [90]. Rathore, Kashif, Khalil, Chaudhry Abdul, Aslam, Nauman (2017). The influence of leadership styles on employees' performance under perceptions of organizational politics: A study of telecom sector in Pakistan. *International Journal of Management Research and Emerging*, 7 (1), 106-140.
- [91]. Rouche, J. E., Baker, G. A. and Rose, R. R. (1989). *Shared vision: Transformational leadership in American community Colleges*. Community College Press, Washington, DC.
- [92]. Ryan, R. M., and Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychology*, 55, 68-78.
- [93]. Salaman, G. G., Storey, J. J. and Billsberry, J. (2005). Strategic Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. *Sage Publication Ltd*.
- [94]. Savovic, S. (2017). The impact of the dimensions of transformational leadership on the post-acquisition performance of the acquired company. *Economic Horizons*, 19 (2), 97-109.
- [95]. Schmieg, G. A. (2018). A leadership analysis of executive directors of state vocational rehabilitation agencies. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.
- [96]. Smith, T. D., Eldridge, F. and DeJoy, D. M. (2016). Safety-specific transformational and passive leadership influences on firefighter safety climate perceptions and safety behavior outcomes. *Safety Science*, 86 92-97
- [97]. Sougui, A. O., Bon, A. T. and Hassan, H. M. H. (2015). The impact of leadership styles on employees' performance in Telecom Engineering companies. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 8(4), Pages: x-x.
- [98]. Spano-Szekely, L., Griffin, M.T.Q., Clavelle, J. and Fitzpatrick, J.J. (2016). Emotional intelligence and transformational leadership in nurse managers. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 46 (2), 101-108
- [99]. Stogdill, R. M. (1976). A handbook of leadership, New York: The free press.
- [100]. Strukan, Edin, Nikolić, Milan and Sefić, Senad (2017). Impact of transformational leadership on business performance. *Tehnički vjesnik*, 24 (2), 435-444.
- [101]. Suifan, T. S., Al-Janini, M. (2017). The relationship between transformational leadership and employees' creativity in the Jordanian Banking Sector. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(2), 284-292.
- [102]. Tajasom, A., Hung, D. K. M., Nikbin, D. and Hyun, S. S. (2015). The role of transformational leadership in innovation performance of Malaysian SMEs. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation*, 23 (2), 172-188
- [103]. Tannenbaum, R., and Schmidt, W.H. (1973). How to choose a leadership pattern. Harvard Business Review: 51 (3).
- [104]. Tetteh, E. N., and Brenyah, R. S. (2016). Organizational leadership styles and their impact on employees' job satisfaction: Evidence from the mobile Telecommunications sector of Ghana. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management* 4 (4), 12-24.
- [105]. Teymournejad, K. and Elghaei, R. (2017). Effect of transformational leadership on the creativity of employees: An empirical investigation. *Engineering, Technology and Applied Science Research* 7(1), 1413-1419.
- [106]. Tierney, P., Farmer S. M., and Graen, G. B (1999). "An examination of leadership and employee creativity. The relevant of traits and relationships", *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 591-620.
- [107]. Tran, Xuan (2015). Effects of leadership styles on hotel financial performance. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 23 (2), 163-183.
- [108]. Ukeje, O, Akabogu, G.C. and Ndu, A.N (1992). "The goal achievement", fourth dimension publishers Ltd.
- [109]. Ukessays. Validity Reliability Qualitative. (2003). (web page) (Ref. 26.2.2012).
- [110]. Veliu, L. M., Mimoza, D. V. and Jahaj, L. (2017). The influence of leadership styles on employee's performance. *Vadyba Journal of Management*, 2 (31), 1648-7974.
- [111]. Victor, J. and Hoole, C. (2017). The influence of organisational rewards on workplace trust and work engagement. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management/SA Tydskrif vir Menslikehulbronbestuur*, 15(0), a853. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v15i0.853>
- [112]. Voon, M. L., Lo, M. C., Ngu, K. S. and Ayo, N. B. (2011). The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in public sector organizations in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences*, 2 (1), 24-32.
- [113]. Vries, R. E., Roe, R. A. and Taillieu, T. C. B. (1998). Need of supervision: Its impact on leadership effectiveness. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34 (4), 486-501
- [114]. Waiyaki, E. W. (2017). *Effect of motivation on employee performance: A case of PAM Golding Properties Limited*, Nairobi. Unpublished Master of Science in Organizational Development (MOD) Thesis, United States International University-Africa, Nairobi.
- [115]. Waris, M., Khan, A., Ismail, I., Adeleke, A. Q. and Panigrahi, S (2018). *Impact of leadership qualities on employee commitment in multi-project-based organizations*. IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 140 012094 doi :10.1088/1755-1315/140/1/012094.
- [116]. Wikipedia.org/wiki/goal Dictionary. Reference. Com/employee
- [117]. Yahaya, R. and Ebrahim, F. A. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: Literature review. *Journal of Management Development*, 35 (2), 190-2016
- [118]. Yahaya, S. A. (2015). *Leadership styles, types and students' academic achievement in Nigeria*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy in Education Thesis, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia.
- [119]. Yıldız, Sebahattin, Baştürk, Faruk, Boz, İlknur Taştan (2014). *The effect of leadership and innovativeness on business performance*. 10th International Strategic Management Conference, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 150 785 – 793.
- [120]. Zhu, Y., Akhtar, S. (2014). How transformational leadership influences follower helping behavior: The role of trust and prosocial motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(3), 373-392.

- [121]. Zia-ud-Din, Muhammad, Shabbir, Muhammad Aqib, Asif, Saad Bin, Bilal, Muhammad and Raza, Mahmood (2017). Impact of Strategic Leadership on Employee Performance. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7 (6).