

# Impact of Leadership on Organizational Productivity (A Case Study of Tuyil Pharmaceutical Industry Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria)

P.O Oladipo<sup>1</sup>, T.A Ipinloju<sup>2</sup>, A.B Folorunsho<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(Department Of Industrial Relations and Personnel Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University Of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria)

<sup>2</sup>(Department Of Industrial Relations and Personnel Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University Of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria)

<sup>3</sup>(Department Of Civil Engineering, Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria)

Date of Submission: 20-11-2020

Date of Acceptance: 03-12-2020

**ABSTRACT:** The study aimed at assessing the impact of leadership in achieving Organization Objectives at Tuyil Pharmaceutical Industries, with the objective of examining the effect of different leadership style on employees' performance in achieving the organization productivity. A descriptive survey research strategy was adopted in which 193 usable structured questionnaires was used in data collection. The leadership styles was measured through the Multi factor Leadership Questionnaire structured into 5-likert scale ratings to fit the context of the study. Descriptive Statistical and inferential statistical techniques was used for data analysis. In inferential statistical Techniques, Pearson's correlation and regression analysis were used to assess both relationships and effects as per the hypotheses of the study. The findings showed that transformational leadership style is the most effective leadership style at Tuyil Pharmaceutical Industries Ilorin. The study found that, transformational leadership could have greater effects on organizational productivity and the quality of the performance of employees in Tuyil pharmaceutical industries Ilorin at ( $p=0.000<0.05$ ). Also organizational productivity is above average as found in the analysis. The results suggest that managers and supervisors in the organization need to use a lot of transformational leadership behaviors or rather embrace transformational leadership style, and less of transactional leadership. It is recommended therefore that Transformational leadership is the most effective leadership styles adopted by the management of the sampled manufacturing industry in Kwara State Ilorin.

**KEYWORDS:** Leadership, Organizational Productivity.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study: Leadership is an important aspect that needs to be carefully looked into in every organization without an effective leader the organization will not produce up to expectation. There is no general definition of leadership because leadership is complex and because it is studied in different ways.

[19] Leadership ability is the lid that determines a person's level of effectiveness. The level of how workers perform in the organization depends on the ability of the leader. Also the forms of leadership we have affect the following, job satisfaction: organizational, commitment and productivity. [24] Explains that the excellent leader not only inspires subordinates' potential to enhance efficiency, but also meets their requirements in the process of achieving the common target of the organization. Leadership in an organization is different from Manager. It is possible for an individual to be an effective manger but not a leader. Success without leadership ability brings limited effectiveness, if there is absence of a good leadership ability an individual impact or the person's impact is to a little to what he or she ought to perform. People tends to use the term managers and a leader interchangeable, however the usage is not correct. Management and Leadership are related but different concept, leadership is one of the five management functions (planning, organizing, staffing, leading and controlling) some can be a manager without through being a leader. Leadership potentials is very important to everyone in an organization. However, some other studies [1] suggest that role of leadership is not so important in achieving the organizational performance. This study contradict the findings of the above mentioned that leadership is the most

important factor to achieve organizational performance or productivity.  
Terms to consider.

❖ **Leadership**

❖ **Organizational Productivity.**

The word “leadership” originates in the ancient root Leith, which meant “to go forth and die” as in battle.

❖ **Leadership:** This is the ability to guide, direct and motivate others in order to make effective use of people. Leadership to [26] is “the process of influencing people and providing an environment for them to achieve or organizational objectives”.

According to [23] Leadership is an influencing process of leaders and followers to achieve organizational objective through leadership skills must be developed.

[17] Defined leadership as a process of influencing others to facilitate the attainment of organizational goal.

[32] Defined leadership as a social influence processes in which the leader seeks voluntary participation of subordinate in an effort to reach organizational goal. These definitions perceive leadership as using the positive influence to make other people to work because of the word “voluntary” appears in the definition.

Leadership is defined as the process of influencing others to accomplish the mission inspiring.

[37] Defines leadership as a process of directing and influencing the task of related activities of group members. It can also be seen as the process of influencing other people to achieve organizational objectives.

[20] Leadership is defined as the process of influencing others to work willingly towards an organizational goal with confidence.

Management is different from leadership likewise leadership is different from a leader, there is a huge difference between a leader and leadership, A Person who leads someone else or a group people, leadership refers to the manner and method in which leaders lead.

Leadership style in an organization has impacted in determining the level of productivity in an organization. The type of leadership style adopted in an organization determines the performance of worker which will determine the productivity in an organization. The importance of leadership is to impact the employee in order to perform effectively. Having a high performance organization depends on having proper structure

and culture which in turn may contribute to higher levels of employee satisfaction and motivation.

❖ **Organizational Productivity**

Productivity is an important aspect or concepts in an organization. We have many different definitions of productivity, but it is commonly defined as the percentage of ratio of output to input.

The word productivity first appeared in literature in 1766. According to SUMANTH probably first time used by FRENCH MATHEMATICIAN in an article in 1766. Productivity is achieving quality results that assist in the contribution of organizational purpose. Productivity is being effective and efficient in the accomplishment of organization goal and objective.

Organizational productivity is the capacity of an organization, institution, or business to produce desired results with a minimum expenditure of energy, time, money, personnel, and material.

[1] Organizational performance means the “transformation of inputs into outputs for achieving certain outcomes.

[29] He defined it as any work which fixed itself in a tangible object. Productivity is commonly defined as a ratio between the output volume and the volume of inputs.

[39] Organizational performance cover three specific areas of firm outcomes;

a) Financial performance (profits, return on assets, return on Investment, etc.).

b) Product market performance (sales, market share, etc.), and

c) Shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc).

Finally, leadership in an organization can have a positive or negative effect. Organizational leadership is above all responsible for providing proper organizational structure and shaping the flow of organizational culture. Efficient and effective performers are fuels to the engine of high productivity in an organization which eventually results in a high performance organization.

**Statement of the Problem**

People may think leadership is a simple concept in an organization but leadership is a complex issue. Leadership in an organization does not actually mean its performance but it is the relationship between the person who leads and the worker or subordinate.

Ineffective leader in workplace have effect on employees or workers and the company as a whole, ineffective leadership leads to misuse of

resources, the employee or even the leader lose interest to work, low productivity and also high turnover. Inadequate leader also perform below expectation.

However there is no gainsaying that most of the challenges faced by organization is as a result of poor management and ineffective leadership.

Furthermore the problem in the organization maybe as a result of absence of motivational factor in the organization such as bonuses, incentives, problem in the organization may also be as a result of the leadership style in the organization.

### Objectives of the Study

The all-encompassing objective of the organization is to examine the impact of leadership on organizational productivity in TUYIL PHARMACETICAL INDUSTRY LIMITED. This study will examine how leaders will improve organizational performance. The objectives include

1. To examine the impact of leadership on organizational productivity.
2. To examine the relationship between leadership style and organizational productivity.
3. To examine the Impact of leadership style on the utility of resources.
4. To examine the effect of motivating leadership on organizational productivity.

### Research Questions

1. In what way does leadership affect the organizational productivity?
2. What are the significant relationship between leadership style and organizational productivity?
3. In what way does leadership style have impact on the utility of resources?
4. What are the effects of motivating skills in a leader on organizational productivity?

## II. METHODOLOGY

The target population involved the total number of employee in Tuyil Pharmaceutical Company Limited. The total number of staff in Tuyil Pharmaceutical Industries Limited which is situated at No 22 New Yidi Road Ilorin, Kwara State is 373 employee which consist of both Permanent and Temporary Staff, Permanent staff Male 46 Female 104, Temporary Staff Male 89 Female 134. This study was conducted among the various units where selected heads and other members of staff of were sampled to obtain in-depth data on how leadership affects organizational Productivity.

### Sample and Sampling Technique

A Sample is a smaller collection of units for observation or measurement to ascertain statistical information about the population.

Sampling, it is a method of choosing elements from a big population. Stratified random sampling method was used in this study, because it is considered the simplest, most convenient and also bias free selection techniques or method.

Sample formula

$$N = \frac{N}{1 + N(0.05)^2}$$

Where

n = desired sample size

N = size of the population

e = Margin Error 5% (0.05)

Computing with the above formula, the number of questionnaires to be administered was obtained.

$$N = 373$$

$$e = 0.05 \text{ or } 5\%$$

$$n = \frac{373}{1 + 373(0.05)^2} = 193.01$$

$$n = 193$$

In order to arrive at a valid and reliable conclusion, we administered questionnaires which were all filled and returned.

### Instrument for Data Collection

The data collected was mainly based on primary source, Primary data in form of questionnaire and interview were used in this research, for the questionnaire these study adopted a five point rating questionnaire. The study made use a five point rating scale questionnaire. This was used in order to allow respondent free access to choose the options that best suit their answers. This comprises of; SA-Strongly Agreed, A-Agreed, N-Neutral, D-Disagreed, SD-Strongly Disagreed.

### Method of Data Collection

The questionnaire method and interview are the two method use in carrying out research for the purpose of this study.

For this study, a five (5) point rating scale questionnaire was designed and administered or sample of the study. This draws the primary data method of data collection for the study.

## III. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter covers the presentation of responses, analysis and findings of data collection and administration evidently supported by questionnaire. The study in an attempt to collect data relevant to the study distributed copies of 193 questionnaires that cover 51.7% of the total employees of the selected company using Yaro

Yamane's formula. In addition, it is important to state that all copies of questionnaire in all were filled, completed and returned. As a result, presentation, analysis and discussion in this chapter

were based on the one hundred and ninety-three (193) retrieved copies of questionnaire as shown in the following tables.

**Table 4.1: Sample Size Returned**

Questionnaire	Frequency	Percentage
Returned	193	100%
Not-returned	0	0%
Total	193	100%

Source: Author's computation, 2018

Table 4.1 shows that 193 copies of questionnaires administered were returned for data grid preparation in the quest for the study that is 100% of distributed copies were returned as duly

completed and used for further statistical analysis and by implication the responses rate was good to further enhance the accuracy of the findings.

**Table 4.2.7: Job Classification**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Marketing	78	40.4	40.4	40.4
Finance	11	5.7	5.7	46.1
HRM	22	11.4	11.4	57.5
Others	82	42.5	42.5	100.0
Total	193	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS Computation, 2018

Department were classified according to the basic jobs carried out by different set of people in the sampled organization. 40.4% were in marketing department, 5.7% were in finance, HR-department were staffed by 11.4% of the total

population and about 42.5% were in other departments like Laboratory and production units. This show that the sampled organizations were most adequately staffed in production and laboratory units.

#### 4.4 Data Analysis According to the Research Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1: There is no significant impact of leadership on organizational productivity.**

**Table 4.4.1: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.939 <sup>a</sup>	.882	.882	.52029

a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership

The model summary show the Pearson's moment correlation between leadership and organizational productivity; R=0.939 shows the degree of the relationship and that there is positive perfect relationship between the response and the predictor. Hence, R<sup>2</sup> values and adjusted R<sup>2</sup> are

equal. This implies the result from this sample size is reliable and it produces same result as when total population is considered. Therefore, it is posited that 88.2% of organizational productivity increase as leadership role in the selected organization increase by 1% and the remaining 11.8%

unexplained in the model were accounted for other factors beyond the scope of this study which may

likely be governmental policy or competitors in the same line of business.

**Table 4.4.2 ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	387.602	1	387.602	1.432E3	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	51.704	191	.271		
	Total	439.306	192			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational productivity

The ANOVA table above complements the findings on the relationship by conducting a diagnostic check on the overall significance of the model. That is the ratio of Regression (387.602) to the total sum of square (439.306) gives exactly the value of estimated  $R^2=0.882$  and that the model accounted for most of the variation. Since F calculated value is (1.432E3) and F tabulated value is (3.84), this implies that F calculated is greater

than the F tabulated. In addition, the significant value of P (0.000) is smaller than (0.05) which means that the independent variable (Leadership) is positively related with the dependent variable (organizational productivity). Therefore, it is posited that there is significance relationship between Organizational productivity and leadership at 5% level. Hence Null hypothesis will be rejected why the alternative hypothesis will be accepted. This implies that there is significant impact of leadership on organizational productivity.

**Table 4.4.3 Regression Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.198	.073		-2.713	.007
	Leadership	1.004	.027	.939	37.840	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational productivity

Regression coefficients in table 4.3.4 further revealed the true contribution of leadership to organizational productivity. Using a Standardized beta-coefficient (0.939), a 1% increase in leadership role will cause 93.9% increase in organizational productivity at 95% confidence level. The constant (-0.198) in the

regression line depict the fact that with no leadership role adopted, there is likelihood occurrence of 19.8% reduction in organizational productivity as shown in the value. This implies that there is significant impact of leadership on organizational productivity at 5% level.

**Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between leadership style and organizational productivity.**

**Table 4.4.4 Pearson Moment Correlations**

		Productivity	Transformation Leaders	Translational Leaders
Productivity	Pearson Correlation	1	.905**	.879**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	439.306	355.264	315.130
	Covariance	2.288	1.850	1.641
	N	193	193	193
Transformation Leaders	Pearson Correlation	.905**	1	.917**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	355.264	351.161	293.824
	Covariance	1.850	1.829	1.530
	N	193	193	193
Transactional Leaders	Pearson Correlation	.879**	.917**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	315.130	293.824	292.580
	Covariance	1.641	1.530	1.524
	N	193	193	193

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

The result in table 4.4.4 indicate that the correlation across the table.

Transformational leadership style and organizational productivity is significant at 5% and 1% respectively. Translational leadership style and productivity equally is significant at 5% and 1% respectively. Though the result indicate that Transformational leadership has a better chance to increase organizational productivity better than the Transactional leadership style if adopted by the selected organization. This is because it has a better chance of 2.6% robustness in the relationship with productivity more than the Transactional leadership style as shown in their

Correlation coefficients ( $R_1=0.905$ ;  $R_2=0.879$ ) respectively. The cross products and sum of square is also high. The high covariance of transformation leadership style implies that the selected organization is more of transformational leaders than the translational leaders. Therefore, it is posited that there are significance relationship between organizational productivity and the type of leadership style adopted at 5% level.

**Hypothesis 3: There is no significant impact of leadership style on utility of resources.**

**Table 4.4.4 Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.840 <sup>a</sup>	.706	.705	.62738

a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership style

To assess the level of relationship between leadership style and resources utilization (in the form of cost minimization), simple regression analysis was carried out. The result of the

regression model in the table shows the value of the regression coefficient  $R = .840$ ,  $R$ -square = .706 and adjusted  $R$ -square = .705. From this result, the extent of relationship between

leadership style and utility of resources in the selected organization is clarified by the value of the R-square. The R-square value denotes 70.6% of reduced costs increase is accounted specifically by

increase in effective leadership style by 1% and not more than 29.4% explained by others not included in this model.

**Table 4.4.5: ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	180.748	1	180.748	459.208	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	75.179	191	.394		
	Total	255.927	192			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership Style

b. Dependent Variable: Resources Utilization

The analysis of variance table 4.4.5 showed regression sum of square value of (180.748) which is higher than the residual sum of square value of (75.179). This implies that the model accounted for most of the variations in the dependent variable. More so, the F calculated value of (459.208) is greater than the tabulated value of (3.84) indicating a significant relationship. In addition, the significant value of P (0.000) is

smaller than (0.05) which means that the independent variable (Leadership style) is positively related with the dependent variable (resource utility). Hence, null hypothesis will be rejected why alternative hypothesis will be accepted, it is posited that there is significant relationship between resources utilization measured through reduction in the cost of production and leadership style at 5% level.

**Table 4.4.6 Regression Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.473	.088		-5.348	.000
	Leadership style	.974	.045	.840	21.429	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Resources Utilization

The beta value of the constant is -0.473 whereas; the beta value for the predictor variable (Leadership style) is 0.995. The t-value of 21.429 and the p-value of .000 indicates the model is significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Therefore, the beta coefficient (Beta= 0.840) implies utility will increase by 84% if leadership style is varied by

one. Also if peradventure leadership style is zero (i.e. Leadership role= 0), Resources Utilization will decrease and this will further reduce productivity by 47.3% and this might constitute a threat to the business growth of the company as shown by the constant value (-0.473) in the regression table.

**Hypothesis 4: There is no significant effect of motivation on organizational productivity.**

**Table 4.4.7: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.915 <sup>a</sup>	.838	.837	.51665

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation

The result of the model summary in table 4.4.7 indicates the degree of relationship between motivational leader and organizational productivity. The R=0.915 implies there is strong

positive relationship between Motivation and organizational productivity and that 0.1% variance in organizational productivity is negligible and very small to further drawn the inference that the

model sample is a true reflection of the total population as shown in the difference of  $R^2$  and adjusted- $R^2$  (0.838-0.837). This implies that 83.8% of organizational productivity increase as a result

of increase in motivation by 1% while the remaining 16.2% of other factors not included accounted for the model.

**Table 4.4.8 ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	263.526	1	263.526	987.275	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	50.982	191	.267		
	Total	314.508	192			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Motivation

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational productivity

The observed regression sum of square (263.526) is higher than the residual (50.982). This implies that model accounted for most of the variation and that the model accuracy lie in the ratio of regression sum of square and total sum of square which give approximate evidence that there is significance relationship between Motivation and Organizational productivity at 5% level (i.e.  $p=0.000<0.05$ ). In addition, the significant value of P (0.000) is smaller than (0.05) which means that

the independent variable (Motivation) is positively related with the dependent variable (organizational productivity). The F calculated value is (987.275) and F tabulated value is (3.84), therefore there is significant relationship between motivation and organizational productivity. Hence, Null hypothesis will be rejected why the alternative hypothesis will be accepted, this implies that there is significant effect of motivation on organizational productivity.

**Table 4.4.9 Regression Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.938	.078		75.665	.000
	Motivation	.933	.030	.915	31.421	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational productivity

The beta coefficient of the model in table above indicates the beta value of the constant is 5.938 whereas; the beta value for the predictor variable (Motivation) is 0.952. The t-value of 31.421 and the p-value of .000 indicates the model is significant at  $p<0.05$ . Therefore, the beta coefficient (Beta= 5.938) implies the level of productivity increase by 91.5% as the motivation increase 1%. With the value of constant (5.938) in the regression coefficients above, there is likelihood chance that it will be difficult for the industry to have up to 6-times boosted in productivity in a year as motivation is 0. Therefore it is concluded that there is a significant impact of motivation on the organizational productivity at 5% level.

#### IV. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings in hypothesis 1 indicate that 88.2% of organizational productivity increase as leadership role in the selected organization increase by 1% and the remaining 11.8% unexplained in the model were accounted for other factors beyond the explanation of this study which may likely be governmental policy or competitors in the same line of business. This implies that the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative accepted by posited that there is significant impact of leadership role on organizational productivity.

The correlation analysis in hypothesis 2 indicated that, transformational leadership positively impacted to organizational productivity. If supervisors or managers exhibited more transformational leadership style than translational

leadership as shown in the table of correlation for comparison, the organization will have higher productivity and organization objective will be achieved more rapidly. As predicted, this result supported alternative hypothesis 2. Transformational leadership positively affects organization productivity at 5% level of significant as shown by beta-coefficient (0.905) in the table. Therefore the second hypothesis of this study which stated that the transformational leadership style positively does not have any significant effect on organization productivity in Tuyil Pharmaceutical Industries could not be supported at 5% level of significant. This result of transformational leadership were not consistent with the work on previous studies reviewed in the literatures like Obiwuru, Okwu, Akpa and Nwakwere (2011) in the effect of leadership style on organizational performance which showed that transformational leadership style had positive but insignificant effect on performance. Though this finding is aligned with the work of Ojokuku, Odetayo and Sajuyigbe who concluded that transformational and democratic leadership style should be employed by the bank management in order to wax stronger in a global competitive environment.

The findings in third hypothesis that “leadership style has no significant impact on utility of resources” could not be supported. This is because the result obtained implies that cost of production is minimized as leadership style improved in the sampled organization, the study findings are consistent with opinion of all staff in the construct of RQ3 that 89.1% agreed to the claim that cost of production is reduce as the leaders in the selected organization is effective in their work through. This implies the majority of respondents aware that production costs can be cut-down through effective leaders and that if peradventure leadership style is zero (i.e. Leadership role = 0), Resources Utilization will decrease and this will further reduce productivity by 47.3% and might negatively affect the business growth of the company as shown in constant value (-0.473) in the regression table of hypothesis 3. Therefore there is significant impact of leadership style on utility of resources in sampled industry.

Lastly, the study found that laissez-faire leadership styles recognized the importance of motivation on organization productivity. This finding is consistent with the fourth hypothesis which stated that “motivations do impact positively to organizational productivity at Tuyil Pharmaceutical Industries Ilorin”. The results lend strong support to the previous evidence by

Prachi & Juneja (2011) who opined that employees as well as manager should possess leadership and motivational traits as an effective leader who have thorough knowledge of motivational factors for others to emulate in order to increase organizational productivity.

## V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

### Summary of Key Findings

The findings showed that transformational leadership style is the most exhibited style at Tuyil Pharmaceutical Industries Ilorin followed by the transactional leadership style and laissez-faire. Organizational productivity is above average. Overall, scores in transformational leadership style were found to be strong and highly correlated with both measures of organization productivity and overall performance which had significant positive correlation with quality of product in the Tuyil Pharmaceutical Industries Ilorin.

Therefore using transformation ideas as a motivational leader will impact positively to organizational productivity because of the germane of its value of correlation which is most significant and higher than transactional leadership style in the analysis. Hence motivation has a significant impact on productivity if adopted effectively by positive thinkers in leadership role in manufacturing industry.

### Conclusions and Implications

From the findings it can be concluded that managers and administrators of the pharmaceutical industry are driven by the desire to achieve organization objectives for better performance from employees by exhibiting transformational ideas that will spring up motivational spirit of their employees by morally emulating the same from those in realm of leadership to sustain organizational productivity of the company.

### REFERENCE

- [1]. Anees Ullah Karamat (2013). Impact of Leadership on Organizational Performance. A Case Study of d& r Cambric Communication Business. Business Economics and Tourism.
- [2]. Bass B.M. & Stogdill's (2000). Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Application.
- [3]. Bass, B. M. and Avolio B. J. (1990). Developing Transformational Leadership, Journal of European Industrial Training, 14, 21–27.
- [4]. Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., Jung, D.I., and

- Berson, Y.I. (2003). 'Predicting Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership': *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88 (2), p.207-218.
- [5]. Bass, B.M.(1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectation*. New York: The FreePress.
- [6]. Batten, J. D. (1989). *Tough-minded leadership*. New York: AMACO.
- [7]. Colin Phelan and Julie Wren,(2005). *Exploring Reliability In Academic Assessment*.
- [8]. Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River.
- [9]. Ehsan Mostashari (January 2009). *Impact of Organizational Leadership on Organizational Performance: A Study on Small and Medium Size Private Companies in Three Cities of Tehran, Mashhad, Isfahan, Iran*.
- [10]. Etzioni (1961). *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management United Kingdom Vol. II, Issue 9, Sep 2014*.
- [11]. Furnham A (2005). *The Psychology of Behavior at Work: The Individual in the Organization*, 2nd edn. Psychology Press, East Sussex, UK.
- [12]. Goddy Osa Igbaekemen (2014). *Impact of Leadership Style on Organization Performance: A Strategic Literature Review*. Department of Sociology, Nigeria Police Academy, Wudil, Kano State, Nigeria.
- [13]. Hackman, J. R & Walton, R E. (1986). *Leading Groups in Organizations*. In P. S. Goodman, & Associates (Eds.), *Designing Effective Work Groups*
- [14]. Hollander, T. (1978). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectation*. New York: The Free Press. (14), 121-124.
- [15]. *Human Relations in organization* (2013). *Applications and Skills Building ninth Edition*.
- [16]. ISSA, A.I. (2014). *Essential Of Modern Management (Principles and Elements) Revised Edition*.
- [17]. John, M.I, Robert .k. & Michael.T.M (2005). *Organizational Behavior and Management McGraw-Hil pub, 7th edition; 492-512*.
- [18]. John Edoka (2012). *Effective Leadership and Organizational Performance: A Case Study of National Youth Service Corps (Nysc) Kogi State*.
- [19]. Maxwell, John (2007): *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership Work Book*, Thomas Nelson publishers, New York.
- [20]. Lawal A (1993) *Management in Focus*. (Lagos Abdul Industrial Enterprises)
- [21]. *Leadership styles* (2010). *Using the Right One For Your Situation*, Retrieved July 20, from <http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR84.htm>.
- [22]. Lussier, (2013). *Human Relations in Organization Applications and Skill Building 9<sup>th</sup> Edition*
- [23]. Lussier and Achua (2007). *Effective Leadership Third Edition*.
- [24]. Madu, Ndidi September (2014). *Impact Of Leadership Styles On The Performance of Selected Transport Companies In Benue State, Nigeria*.
- [25]. McShane, S. L. and Van Glinow M. (2000). *Emerging Realities for Workplace Revolution "Organizational Behavior"*. McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. U.S.A.
- [26]. Mishane, L. and Glinow, V. (2000). *'Leadership Styles: How to Handle the Different Persons'*. *Strategic Communication Management*. 15(8).
- [27]. Mullins, L.J. (2002). *Management and Organizational Behavior*, (5th Edition) Britain: Pearson Educational Ltd.
- [28]. Nwachukwu (1988). *Personnel Administration in Nigeria*, University of Port-Harcourt press, Nigeria.
- [29]. Paul Krugman (1994). *Defining and Measuring Productivity, The Age Of Diminishing Establishment*.
- [30]. Rauch, C.F., & Behling, O. (1984). *Functionalism: Basis for an alternate approach to the study of leadership*. In J. G. Hunt, D. M. Hosking, C. A. Schriesheim, and R. Stewart (Eds.), *Leaders and Managers: International Perspectives on Managerial Behavior and Leadership*. New York: Pergamon Press, pp. 45-62.
- [31]. Richard L. Draft (2010) *New Era of Management* Vanderbilt University, South-Western, Cengage Learning.
- [32]. Robert, K. & Angelo, K. (2004). *Organizational Behavior; McGraw-Hill pub 6th edition; pp 595-612*.
- [33]. Stephen p. Robbins, Timothy A. Judge and Neharika Vohra (2013). *Organizational behavior fifteenth edition*.
- [34]. Stevenson, William J. (1990). *Production and Operations Management*. Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- [35]. Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.E. (1957). *Leader Behavior its Description and Measurement*.

- Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, the Ohio State University, 88, 1-27.
- [36]. Stone (2000), A.G Russell, R.F, & Patterson, K. (2003). Transformational Versus Servant Leadership: A Difference in Leader Focus. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.
- [37]. Stoner, D. (2000). The Principle of Effective Leadership.
- [38]. Verma A.A. and N, Mohan (2011). Industrial Management. [Wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizational\\_performance](http://Wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizational_performance).
- [39]. William A. Cohen (1990). The Art of the Leader Hardcover, January 1.
- [40]. Williams Arruda (2016). Difference between a Leader and Manager, November 5<sup>th</sup> edition.