

Leadership Styles and Productivity of Tea Growing and Processing Firms in Uganda

¹Mbonye Emmanuel (Researcher)
Ndejje University
P.o Box 7088, Kampala, Uganda

²Paul William Kitata (Lecturer)
Ndejje University
P.o Box 7088, Kampala, Uganda

³Nazarious Rukanyangira
Senior Lecturer in Business Administration
Muni University, P O Box 725 Arua, Uganda
Ndejje University
P.o Box 7088, Kampala, Uganda

Abstract:- This article examines the relationship between leadership styles and productivity of Tea Growing and Processing Firms in Uganda using a case of Mityana Tea Estates. The study specifically aimed at achieving three objectives, namely to; establish the relationship between authoritative leadership style and organizational productivity; determine the influence of charismatic leadership style on organizational productivity; and assess the effect of laissez-faire leadership style on productivity of Mityana Tea Estates. Correspondingly, the study conducted a comprehensive literature review in which the works of principle authors such as Lewin (1938 &1939), Fiedler (1964, 1978 & 1997), Yulk (1999, 1992 & 2013), and International Standards Organization (ISO 9000: 2005) were reviewed. The researcher employed a triangulation of descriptive, correlational and cross sectional survey research designs. Self-administered questionnaires and Structured Interviews were used to collect data from a sample of 132 respondents. The data collected was analyzed using correlations and regression analyses with aid of the statistical package for social scientists (SPSS). The study results showed that there is statistically significant positive relationships between authoritative leadership style ($r=0.671$, $p<0.01$), charismatic leadership style ($r=0.691$, $p<0.01$) and laissez faire Leadership style ($r=0.695$, $p<0.01$) with organizational productivity. It is against this backdrop, that the study concludes that each of the leadership styles exerts positive effect on organizational productivity. However, the study findings with multiple compound regression coefficients on the relationship between leadership styles and organizational productivity revealed that the t-value for Authoritative leadership style in the model is 1.701 which is less than 1.96, thus implying that it is less significant. Additionally, the t-value for Charismatic leadership in the model is 3.202; and laissez faire leadership is 3.695 which is greater than 1.96. This reveals that if the leadership styles are applied jointly in the same environment, charismatic leadership styles and laissez faire leadership styles are collectively significant ($P=0.002$, and $p=.000$ respectively), while authoritative leadership style is less significant ($p=0.91$; $t=1.701$) in

collectively influencing organizational productivity. In light of the afore mentioned, the investigator recommends that authoritative leadership style should be applied to induce organizational productivity with new and inexperienced workers in Tea Growing and Processing Firms with inbuilt strategies for gradual transition to charismatic and laissez faire leadership style as the firm develops, grows and matures with skilled and experienced workers.

Keywords:- Leadership Styles, Organizational Productivity, Charismatic Leadership Style, Authoritative Leadership Style, Laissez Faire Leadership Style.

I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership Styles and Organizational Productivity are key concepts which have received worldwide attention. It is now globally accepted that the Leadership Style espoused by managers either positively or negatively significantly affects Organizational Productivity (Patel, & Buiting, 2013). Globally, several organizations are struggling with fluctuating organizational levels of output, quality of output/service and levels of profits within the existing structures of leadership; a condition that has resulted into crisis mainly with appropriate leadership styles for effective attainment of such anticipated organizational productivity expectations (Yulk *et al.*, 2013).

Consequently, organizational success or failure is thus fundamentally reliant on the embraced leadership style (Boleman & Gallos, 2011). Several studies on leadership and organization productivity posit that leadership traits and styles of the topmost managers undoubtedly affect organizational productivity (Argyris, 1995; Mahoney *et al.* 1960). Leadership Style therefore, refers to the method in which a leader typically offers direction, inspires others as well as implementing calculated plans (Mullins, 2000). Perceived by the followers, it includes the overall behavioral patterns of the leaders' oral and non-verbal actions (Newstrom, Davis, 1993). The leadership styles coupled with the leader's behavioral patterns ultimately increases organizational productivity as employees either deliberately

or unintentionally improve group performance (Mohammed & Harrison, 2013).

On the other hand, organizational productivity refers to a summary evaluation of the quantity as well as the quality of work performance, to increase profits through resources utilization. This is normally done at individual, group, or organizational level. Productivity may be expressed as success into dimensions of organization's performance; implying effectiveness and efficiency to realize an adequate level of output (Luthans, 1988). In the same way, organizational productivity may refer to the ability of a firm to achieve such objectives including high level of output, high profit, and quality product resulting into big market portion, health financial results, and continued existence at a particular time using applicable strategy for action in relation to other firms in the same industry (Koontz and Donnell, 1993).

Many tea growing establishments on the African continent are suffering from leadership vacuum which affects productivity of local businesses. Inappropriate leadership in African business establishments is thought to be the cause of most, if not all, productivity related difficulties afflicting African firms (Salawu, 2012 & Cho, 2003). Incidentally, the biggest challenge is that most governments in Africa, including Uganda government assume that preferred service delivery which includes establishing leadership skills among its citizen's is expensive and therefore can only be done after realizing sufficient revenues (Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N., 2022). Allocating a budget and Starting with what is available then continuously improve is always the shortest way for government to take over the citizen's trust and move faster in the process of even supporting private companies to fill the leadership vacuum.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study was based on contingency theory of leadership which was developed based on the idea that there is no single one size fit all leadership style to manage an organization (Karanja, 2014:56). The concept underscores that effective leadership mainly relies on the prevalent state of affairs (Craig, 2009) and it is therefore difficult to achieve desired organizational productivity when the choice of leadership style is not congruent with the prevailing task environment, the nature of the task and the various attitudes of employees (Karanja, 2014: 71). Accordingly, this implies that the leadership style that results into desired organizational productivity differs with a number of situational factors, including employee traits, nature of work as well as the organizational philosophy.

The theory expounds a modification in leadership research from concentrating on the leader to focusing on the situation in which the leader exhibits his or her abilities (Fiedler, 1978). It presupposes that leadership effectiveness is dependent on how well the leader's style fits within the prevailing context. Correspondingly, to comprehend any leader's performance, it is critical to appreciate

circumstances in which the leader exercises his abilities. As such, the leader must be ready to effectively interpret a number of situational variables to be able to make rational decisions concerning his or her actions.

➤ *Purpose of the Study:*

The study's main objective was to examine the influence of leadership styles on organizational productivity of Tea Growing and Processing Firms in Uganda with particular reference to Mityana Tea Estates.

➤ *Objective of the Study*

To establish the relationship between leadership styles and productivity of Tea Growing and Processing Firms in Uganda using Mityana Tea Estates as a case.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership is vital in every situation especially in management of organizations in a sense that the quality of leadership determines the effective functioning of social systems to induce organizational productivity (Dessler, 1998). This view is upheld by Lawal (1993), who denotes to Leadership as the method of persuading others to direct their energies freely and assertively towards the attainment of organizational productivity. In the words of Donnelly (1990), management functions such as planning, organizing and decision making are inactive until the leader prompts the power of motivation in individuals and directs them to organizational productivity goals applying the necessary leadership style. Similarly, Yukl (1994), posits that the structure of specific leadership styles differ broadly basing on personal characteristics, individual behavior, interactive abilities, situational dynamics as well as a mixture of all the above. Leadership styles are a central part of management reflecting the capability and way in which employees are influenced to pursue distinct objectives willingly with cohesiveness and enthusiasm to attain organizational productivity.

According to Armstrong (2004), leadership style is both the approach and ability to influence others freely to act in a different way for purposes of achieving a given task. Northouse (2010), opines that it is a process through which an individual inspires a group of people to accomplish a shared goal. On the contrary Kodish (2006), contends that for leaders to exhibit extraordinary excellence, their ethical behaviors must be strongly upheld. Leadership styles thus involve illustrious methods and organized steps to influence as well as direct the actions of an organized group to achieve organizational productivity through maintaining effective interpersonal relationships and communication; thus good leadership thrives on followers and leaders who relate purposefully to achieve organizational goal of increased productivity (Adebakin & Gbadamosi, 1996).

Inherently, several types of leaders exhibit different leadership styles and traits. Leadership styles may be based on structure, people and production orientation. Kurt Lewin (1939), and other researchers acknowledged three types of Leadership Styles Authoritarian, Democratic and Laissez-

fair that can be identified with a leader. Correspondingly, White and Lippitt (1969), pointed to the above three as the main leadership styles expounded on a scale stretching from democratic through autocratic to Laissez faire to demonstration the degree of power and authority of leaders. However, most investigations have mainly focused on autocratic and democratic with less consideration of laissez-faire which is regarded as dormant and only applicable with motivated followers and leaders at a given time. Lewin *et al* (1938), opinions that the three different leadership styles have numerous disparities amongst them; at one extreme is the autocratic leader, who directs with individual decisions on how to progress. At the other extreme, is a laissez faire leader, who allows followers make their choices of decisions. In the middle is charismatic leader whose democratic traits allows followers` participation in decision making process shaped by the leader`s character and relationship with organizational members (Burke *et al*, 2007).

Consequently, leadership is more inclined on group based relationships, in which the leader`s main roles is on management of relationships amongst followers to achieve organizational productivity (Griffin & Ebert, 2010). It is worth noting that, all leaders build distinct leadership styles in tandem with the situation and capabilities of the followers (Landis, 2011). In the words of Wayne (1998), inherently the success of any business is reliant on the level of organizational productivity. As company sales raise along with improved levels of production, quality and prices, remunerations and other compensations of the worker increase as well. Using the output/input technique, Ocho (1982), in his study opined that productivity is a function of several variables, leadership style inclusive as a key factor influencing productivity of a firm.

Further still, scholars have suggested that improved organizational productivity requires excellent leadership styles as the loopholes in leadership are so costly and cannot easily be fixed (Bell, 2006; Kunzle *et al*, 2010; Spinelli, 2006). Bass (2008), describes the authoritative-autocratic cluster of leadership style as the approach of being power oriented by subjecting others to order, control and coercion to enforce organizational productivity. This implies that when leading in this manner, the leader is solely in control of the performance of their subordinates and of the entire decision making.

Furthermore Sadler (2003), notes that the authoritative leader makes decisions and imposes them on everyone else to facilitate organizational productivity, expects implementation without question regardless of the feelings of others. Weiskittel (1999), further confers that autocratic leadership style involves the use of commands and expected compliance. Use of punishments and threats enforces increased productivity with less regard to the happiness or satisfaction of their followers. The leaders are not only primarily concerned with task accomplishment, but also they maintain considerable social distance from the group they lead (Roosevelt & Gustainis, 2004). Weber (1947), originally conceptualized charismatic leadership as a form

of legitimate authority derived from ecclesiastical divinity. Since then, the concept of charismatic leadership has been used to describe a subset of leaders who by the force of their personal abilities are capable of having profound and extraordinary effects on followers to influence them towards organizational productivity (Chhokar, Brodbeck & House 2013). Charismatic individuals exude confidence, dominance, a sense of purpose, and the ability to articulate a vision for followers to grasp as elucidated by Yukl & Van Fleet (1992) and in turn works hard to achieve the desired organizational productivity (House, 1977; Conger, 1993).

Lewin *et al* (1938), refer to laissez faire leader as the one who provides little or no direction to the followers. Kerns (2004), confers that laissez-faire style of leadership is vital in bridging the gap between the employer and employee as it majorly emphasizes a positive environment through which employees and employers feel like a family regardless of their positions. Likewise Kilburg (2006), urges that the positive self of the manager in his conceptualization of executive wisdom which is comprised of three interacting components: discernment, decision making, and action, all important in building positive psychology in the end creates positive relationships. It should therefore be noted, that laissez-faire style of leadership requires a lot of maturity and understanding of the organizational vision and values by subordinates who should be highly skilled, experienced, and educated who need no regular feedback from superiors as workers are given all the rights and power to make decisions (Hackman and Johnson, 2013 & Malos, 2012). Similarly, Sutermeister (1969), and Williams (1978), affirm that such a style under certain conditions that for example, involve a group of scientists or specialists will be effective.

Laissez-faire leadership may be appropriate with particular skilled workers who do not need a push from their superiors but rather should be allowed to use their particular skills to make decisions as a way of empowering them with a sense of ownership over their work and results in greater motivation to complete tasks (Rubin, 2013). Evidently, free rein thus suits employees at strategic planning level of management who are mostly experts in their roles and have the ability, such as intelligence and technical knowledge for effective freedom (Morgan, 2003).

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed both case study and cross sectional survey designs to compliment the weaknesses of each other in order to validate the findings. Similarly, the study also employed both secondary and primary sources of data. Primary data was collected using self-administered questionnaires comprising of both open and close ended questions from a sample of 132 respondents including field Staff, production/Factory Staff, finance Personnel, administration & Management Staff. The study utilized both probabilistic and non-probabilistic sampling techniques; that is, managers, accountants and administrators were selected using purposive sampling because they were considered as key informants. In contrast, field and factory employees of the estates were selected using simple random sampling.

The data was then analyzed quantitatively using SPSS to obtain frequencies, standard deviation, mean, correlations and regression whereas qualitative data was analyzed using thematic analysis where themes were developed that aided in arriving at major inferences. The overall response rate was 73% and a non-response rate of 27% as 10 questionnaires out of the overall total of 132 were not returned.

➤ *Data Quality Control:*

The researcher determined the validity and reliability of the data collection instruments to ensure that the data collected is accurate and authentic to check and avoid bias and errors.

➤ *Validity of Research Instrument*

Validity of the questionnaire and interview guide was tested using the following formula. According to Dawson (2005), Content validity index (CVI) is highly advised in testing for the validity of any research in controlling statements in the instruments

$$CVI = \frac{\text{Agreed items by all judges as suitable}}{\text{Total numbers of items being judged}}$$

Where;

C – Content

V – Validity

I – Index

$$CVI = \frac{27}{38} = 0.711$$

It was found to be greater than 0.7; the instrument was thus considered valid.

➤ *Reliability of Research Instrument*

The investigator tested reliability of the data collection tool by using the test-retest reliability estimates through repeating the measurement using the same instruments. As such, the self-administered questionnaire and structured interview guides were administered to the same groups of people at two different times, a day in between, and compared the two sets eventually giving the same/similar results after evaluation hence confirming reliability of the tools. Accordingly, the researcher used test re-test reliability because it signifies the internal validity of a test and ensures that the measurements obtained in one sitting are both representative and stable over time as it is conducted over two time-points (T1, T2) over a relatively short period of time.

Table 1 Data Reliability (N=122)

Leadership Styles	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Authoritative leadership style	.789	7
Charismatic leadership style	.825	7
Laissez-faire leadership style	.896	5
Organizational productivity	.730	8
Average	.81	

Source: (Primary Data, 2018)

The table above shows the results of data reliability test using the Cronbach alpha coefficient in SPSS Ver. 22.0. The results indicate that all the Cronbach alpha coefficients were above the recommended 0.7 alpha coefficient by Mugenda and Mugenda (2006). This indicated that research instruments were reliable thus findings were dependable for making empirical conclusions and recommendations.

➤ *Research Findings*

The study aimed at establishing the relationship between leadership styles and organizational productivity in tea growing and processing firms. Based on the study findings and empirical analysis, it was found that each of the leadership styles exerts positive effect on organizational

productivity. On the other hand, each style of leadership considered in this study, can positively induce organizational productivity considering the department and situation in which it is applied.

➤ *Multiple Regression to Test the Effect of Leadership Styles and Organizational Productivity*

The researcher conducted a compound multiple regression analysis of the three styles of leadership; Laissez Leadership Style, Charismatic Leadership Style and Authoritative Leadership Style against organizational productivity in order to generate collective effect of leadership styles and organization productivity. Findings are presented in subsequent tables below;

Table 2 Model Summary from Multiple Regression Effect of Leadership Styles and Organizational Productivity

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.759 ^a	.576	.565	.41943

a. Predictors: (Constant), Laissez leadership style, Charismatic leadership style, Authoritative leadership style

This multiple regression analysis shows a slightly higher Adjusted R-Squared = .565, with a standard error of 0.41943. This was computed and expressed as a percentage to determine the variance of the effect of leadership styles and productivity of Mityana Tea Estates. Thus findings show that leadership styles accounted for 56.5% effect on the productivity of Mityana Tea Estates. The other 53.9% is explained by other factors outside the model and the error term.

Table 3 ANOVA^a on the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Productivity

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	28.148	3	9.383	53.333	.000 ^b
	Residual	20.759	118	.176		
	Total	48.906	121			
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational productivity						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Laissez leadership style, Charismatic leadership style, Authoritative leadership style						

Source: (Primary Data, 2018)

The Table above indicates the F-test results which were used to determine whether the model is a good fit for the data; F-test also explains the variance in the dependent variable. The F-test of 53.333 is highly statistically significant, thus it can be assumed that the model fairly explains a significant amount of the variance in organizational productivity where by p-value (0.000 < 0.01) at 95% confidence level. Since this test is statistically significant, then the model in general has good predictive capability of organizational productivity.

Table 4 Coefficients^a on the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Productivity

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.512	0.147		10.285	.000
	Authoritative leadership style	0.145	0.085	.177	1.707	.091
	Charismatic leadership style	0.272	0.085	.315	3.202	.002
	Laissez leadership style	0.228	0.062	.344	3.695	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational productivity						

Source: Primary data, 2018

Results in the table above give t values. The t-value test the hypothesis that coefficient is different from 0. To reject this, you need a t-value greater than 1.96 (for 95% confidence). The t-value for Charismatic leadership in the model is 3.202; and laissez faire leadership is 3.695 which is greater than 1.96. This implied that collectively in Mityana Tea Estates, charismatic leadership styles and laissez faire leadership styles are collectively significant factors (P=0.002, and p=.000 respectively). However, Authoritative leadership style is not a significant factor (p=0.91; t=1.701) in collectively influencing organizational productivity.

Based on the output of regression coefficient table, the following equation can be generated.

$$Y = C + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 \dots$$

Where y= organization productivity, c= constant, $\beta_1 = 0.145$, $X_1 =$ Autocratic leadership style

$\beta_2 = 0.272$, $X_2 =$ Charismatic leadership style, $\beta_3 = 0.228$, $X_3 =$ Laissez leadership style while C is the constant which = 1.512, and this is the predicted value when authoritative leadership equals zero.

Organization productivity = 1.512 + (0.145 Authoritative leadership style) + (0.272 Charismatic leadership style) + (0.228 Laissez leadership style)

However, all the factors showed a positive effect of leadership styles on organizational productivity. The tests used in the illustration above are reliable for giving satisfactory results that can be based on for final conclusions and recommendations.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the study findings and empirical analysis, it is recommended that incorporation of various leadership styles enables leaders set realistic targets which enhance organizational productivity. However, it is a fundamental prerequisite for all managers to choose the most appropriate style of leadership that suites the organization or department at different occasions.

The study findings with multiple regression coefficients on the relationship between leadership styles and organizational productivity revealed that the t-value for Authoritative leadership style in the model is 1.701 which is less than 1.96, thus implying that it is less significant. On the contrary, the t-value for Charismatic leadership in the model is 3.202; and laissez faire leadership is 3.695 which is greater than 1.96. This implies that if both leadership styles are applied collectively in the same environment, they are collectively significant (P=0.002, and p=.000 respectively), while Authoritative leadership style is less significant (p=0.91; t=1.701) in collectively influencing organizational

productivity. It is from this that the investigator recommends Authoritative leadership style to be applied to induce organizational productivity with new and inexperienced workers in Tea Growing and Processing Firms with inbuilt strategies for gradual transition to charismatic and laissez faire leadership style as the firm develops, grows and matures with skilled and experienced workers.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

From the study findings, it can be concluded that there is a statistically significant positive relationships between Authoritative leadership style ($r=0.671$, $p<0.01$), charismatic leadership style ($r=0.691$, $p<0.01$) and laissez faire Leadership style ($r=0.695$, $p<0.01$) and organizational productivity. Against this background, the study concluded that each of the leadership styles exerts positive effect on organizational productivity. In view of the above, the researcher recommends that Tea Estates should establish active measures to ensure that supervisors guide and work with employees to improving organizational productivity. Correspondingly, Authoritative leadership style should be applied to induce organizational productivity with new and inexperienced workers in Tea Growing and Processing Firms with inbuilt strategies for gradual transition to charismatic and laissez faire leadership style as the firm develops, grows and matures with skilled and experienced workers.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adebakin O I, & Gbadamusi EA (1996), *the Practices of Organizational Leadership*, Ibadan. Adeogun Printing Press.
- [2]. Armstrong, M. (2004), *Managing Performance: Performance Management Inaction*, CIPD, London.
- [3]. Bass, B. M. (2008). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, & Managerial Applications*, 4th Edition, New York City: Free Press.
- [4]. Boleman, L., & Gallos, J. V. (2011), *Reframing Academic Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [5]. Burke, C.S., Sims, D.E., Lazzara, E.H., & Salas, E. (2007). Trust in leadership: A Multi-Level Review and Integration. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(6), 606-632.
- [6]. Chhokar, J. S., Brodbeck, F.C. & House, R.J. (2013), *Culture and Leadership Across the World: The Globe Book of in-depth Studies of 25 Societies*. London: Routledge.
- [7]. Cho, E. S. (2003). Korean Business Ethics with a Focus on the Employees of Private Firms & Public Organizations. *Journal of Organization and Management*. Retrieved on 8/8/2018 from <http://scholar.dkyobobook.co.kr/searchDetail.laf?barcode=4030008722907>
- [8]. Craig, S. (2009), *Management and People*. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved on November 24, 2017 from: <http://guides.wsj.com/management/developing-a-leadership-style/what-is-the-difference-between-management-and-leadership/>
- [9]. Dessler, G. (1998), *Management: Leading People and Organizations in the 21st Century*. Florida: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- [10]. Donnelly, J R. Gibson, J L. Ivancevich, J M. (1990), *Fundamentals of Management*, 7th Edition. Richards D. Irwin, Inc.
- [11]. Fiedler P, (1964, 1978 & 1997), *Contingency Models: Meanings, Methods and Practices*, 4th Edition, McGraw Hill, New York, U.S.
- [12]. Griffin, R.J.; and Ebert, R.W. (2010), *Business Essentials*, 8th Edition, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. pp. 135-136.
- [13]. Hackman, M.Z.; and Johnson, C.E. (2013), *Leadership, a Communication Perspective*, 6th Edition, Waveland Press. USA.
- [14]. House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1994) "What we Know about Leadership, Effectiveness and Personality", *American Psychologist*, 46(6), 493.
- [15]. Karanja, G.M. (2014), Influence of Management Practices on Sustainability of Youth Income Generating Projects in Kangema District Murang'a County, Kenya.
- [16]. Kerns, J. G., Cohen, J. D., MacDonald, A. W., Cho, R. Y., Stenger, V. A., & Carter, C. S. (2004). Anterior cingulate conflict monitoring and adjustments in control. *Science*, 303(5660), 1023-1026.
- [17]. Kilburg, R. R. (2006). *Executive wisdom: Coaching and the emergence of virtuous leaders*. American Psychological Association.
- [18]. Kodish, S. (2006), *the Paradoxes of Leadership: the Contribution of Aristotle*. *Leadership*, 2 (4), 451-468.
- [19]. Koontz, H. & Donnell, C. (1993). *Introduction to Management*. McGraw-Hill Inc., New York. Retrieved on 01/05/1993 (1993). ISBN 10: 0071128921
- [20]. Künzle, B., Kolbe, M., & Grote, G. (2010). Ensuring patient safety through effective leadership behaviour: a literature review. *Safety science*, 48(1), 1-17.
- [21]. Landis, E.A. (2011). 21st Century Leadership Issues as They Pertain to a Small Private Liberal Arts University. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 12(3):108-111. Retrieved April 14, 2018 from: www.irnbrjournal.com/download.php?file=../papers/1475146161
- [22]. Lawal A (1993), *Management in Focus*. Lagos, Abdul Industrial Enterprises.
- [23]. Lewin, K.; Lippitt, R.; and White, R.K. (1938), *Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates*. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10:271-301. Retrieved on 14/04/2018 from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurt_Lewin

- [24]. Lewin, K.; Lippitt, R.; and White, R.K. (1939), Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10:271-301. Retrieved on 14/04/2018 from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurt_Lewin
- [25]. Luthans, F. (1988), *Successful and Effective Real Management*, the Academy of Management Executive, pg 88-89.
- [26]. Malos, R. (2012). Annals of Eftimie Murgu University Resita, Economic Studies, Fascicle II:421-426.
- [27]. Mohammed, S., & Harrison, D. (2013), The Clocks that time us are not the same: A Theory of Temporal Diversity, Task Characteristics, and Performance in Teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 122(2), 244-256.
- [28]. Morgan, D. (2003). Mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for depression: A new approach to preventing relapse.
- [29]. Newstrom, J.W., Davis, K. (1993), *Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [30]. Northouse, P. G. (2010), *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [31]. Ocho (1982), *Management in Theory and Practice*, D P Publication Limited, London
- [32]. Patel G., & Buiting S. (June 2013), Gender Differences in Leadership Styles and the impact within Corporate Boards: *The Commonwealth Secretariat, Social Transformation Programmes Division* retrieved on 6th-8-2018 from <http://www.cpahq.org/cpahq/cpadocs/Genderdiffe.pdf>
- [33]. Roosevelt, T., & Gustainis, J. (2004), *Autocratic Leadership*, In G. Goethals, G. Sorenson, & J. Burns(Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. (pp. 69-73). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- [34]. Rubin, E. N. (2013), *Assessing Your Leadership Style to Achieve Organizational Objectives*. Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 55-66.
- [35]. Sadler, A. G., Booth, B. M., Cook, B. L., & Doebbeling, B. N. (2003). Factors associated with women's risk of rape in the military environment. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 43(3), 262-273.
- [36]. Salawu, A. (2012), The Paradigm of Ethical Development for Civilized Leadership in Africa. *Leadership*, Vol. 8 no. 1 17-27. Retrieved on 7/8/2018 from DOI: 10.1177/1742715011426961
- [37]. Spinelli, R. J. (2006). The applicability of Bass's model of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership in the hospital administrative environment. *Hospital topics*, 84(2), 11-19.
- [38]. Sutermeister, R.A. (1969). *People and Productivity*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- [39]. Twinomujuni, R., Mawa, M., Musoke, H. B., & Rukanyangira, N. (2022). The mediating effect of educational decentralization in the relationship between citizen participation and education service delivery of local governments.
- [40]. Wayne, F. C. (1998), *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Work life, Profit*. 5th Edition, Boston, Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- [41]. Weber M. (1947), *the Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, Henderson AH, Parsons T. Free Press: Glencoe, IL,
- [42]. Weiskittel, Pat. (1999), the Concept of Leadership, *ANNA Journal*, 26(5), 467-468.
- [43]. Yukl, G. A. (1994), *Leadership in Organization*. Englewood cliffs, New Jerseys: Prentice-Hall.
- [44]. Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations.
- [45]. Yukl, Gary, Rubina Mahsud , Shahidul Hassan , and Gregory E. Prussia . (2013). *An Improved Measure of Ethical Leadership, Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*. Retrieved non 25th Feb 2018 from:<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/puar.12562/full>.