

## Effect of Leadership Styles on Performance of Small and Medium Enterprise in Irepodun Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti State

### Author's Details:

<sup>(1)</sup>**Ogunkolade, Ola Sunday**-Department of Procurement, Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti <sup>(2)</sup>**Enitilo, Olalekan**-Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti <sup>(3)</sup>**Dada, Gbenga Olumide**-Department of Business and Entrepreneurship, School of Business and Governance, Kwara State University, Malete, Ilorin, Kwara State

### Abstract

*The study is to examine the examined effect of leadership styles on the performance of small and medium enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti. Specifically, the objectives are transactional leadership styles, transformational leadership styles, laissez faire leadership style on the performance of small and medium enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti. The population for the study comprises 98 SMEs operators from sixteen selected SMEs in Irepodun/Ifelodun local government area. The sample size of the study was 79 respondents. The descriptive statistics were mainly frequency tables while the inferential statistical method was multiple regression analysis. The results showed that inspirational motivation has a positive relationship with the performance of SMEs. It was not found significant; therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. These results showed that Laissez -Faire Leadership has a positive relationship with the performance of SMEs. It was found significant; therefore, we accept alternative hypotheses and reject the null hypothesis. The study concluded that they do not suggest new ways of looking at how to compete with others in the same business, also failed to seeks differing perspectives when solving problem, talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished and articulates a compelling vision of the future, emphasis the important of having a collective sense of mission and also considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions, the business owners of small and medium scale enterprises in the area do not go beyond self-interest for the good of the business and also don not displays a sense of power and confidence.*

**Keywords:** Leadership Styles, Small and Medium Enterprise

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree with what needs to be done and how the job done effectively, as well as to facilitate the process of individual and collective efforts to achieve common goals (Yuki, 2005). Furthermore, Bass and Avolio (1993) state transformational leadership can have a positive influence on the performance and attitude of followers. Spreitzer (1995) suggests that the leadership styles used by employers can improve employee performance is getting better at a higher level.

However, the Nigerian Union of Local Government Employee (NULGE) is playing a vital role in improving the working relationship between the management and the workers in the local government service system. The need for effective leadership that subscribes to proper professional work ethics is fundamental. Olayiwola (2009) posited that in the Nigerian Union of Local Government Employee, for instance, poor corporate governance (unethical practices) is identified as one of the major factors in virtually all known instances of Nigerian Local Government in the country. This implies that a lack of proper ethical standards in public or private sector organizations is detrimental to the development of a nation. For every organization that wants to remain and wax stronger in a global market competitive environment must engage the service of good leaders. The effective leadership style certainly improves the performance of the employees. Ojokuku, Odetayo and Sajuyigbe (2012) confirmed that leadership style is the major determinant of any organization's success especially in both private and publicly owned institutions. Leadership is about having a vision and being able to transform that vision into action by influencing others to perform at higher levels and promoting the importance of organizational performance. Williams (2009) pointed out that leadership creates understanding and recognition of a group's undertaking, purpose and make the workers know beyond their own wants and needs

for the good of the cluster. According to Jago (1982) “Leadership is expressed or displayed through interaction between people and necessarily implies its complement, followership. For one to influence, another must permit himself to be influenced”. He pointed out that different leaders have their own distinctive leadership styles that have proved to be closely associated with their organizational performance and outputs. Hartog, Muijen and Koopman, (1997) noted that transactional leadership, transformational and laissez faire leadership had gained currency and attention over a period of the last few decades. They argued that transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership and laissez faire are directly related to numerous workplace outcomes such as job satisfaction, group performance, employee performance, and organizational commitment.

On the other hand, organizational performance refers to the ability of an enterprise to achieve such objectives as high profit, quality product, large market share, good financial results, and survival at a pre-determined time using a relevant strategy for action (Koontz & Donnell, 1993). Organisational performance can also be used to view how an enterprise is doing in terms of the level of profit, market share and product quality in relation to other enterprises in the same industry. Consequently, it is a reflection of the productivity of members of an enterprise measured in terms of revenue, profit, growth, development and expansion of the organization.

The absence of effective leadership is a serious problem endemic in many organizations. It is obvious that the resultant outcome is poor staff performance, absence of motivation, poor growth and development of the institutions. Hence, this would sort to investigate leadership style and organizational performance. The broad objective of the research work is to examine the effect of leadership styles on the performance of small and medium enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti. The specific objectives are to examine the effect of transactional leadership styles; transformational leadership styles; laissez faire leadership style on the performance of small and medium enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti.

### **Significance of the Study**

This research is relevant in several ways. First of all, scientific relevance has to be mentioned. Although many researchers already examined a lot of antecedents of organisational citizenship behaviour (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000), there is not much research carried out on antecedents of organisational performance in Irepodun Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti. This research tries to reveal several antecedents of organisational performance in Irepodun Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti, and therefore, this will possibly lead to new insights. Besides, there is a practical relevance for the Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government area. The results demonstrated whether employees show leadership styles and organisational performance of small and medium scale enterprises and the way this can be influenced. Since the organisational performance of small and medium scale enterprises is benefiting all companies, the results of this study are interesting because it indicated what type of leadership style is needed to operate small and medium scale enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun local government area.

### **Scope of the study**

The scope of this research work was restricted to registered Small and Medium Scale enterprises located in the Ifelodun/Irepodun Local Government area of Ekiti State. The following variables were considered: Leadership style been the independent variables comprises of transactional, transformational and laissez faire leadership while the dependent variable was organizational performance.

## **2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Concepts of Leadership**

According to Lawal (1993) Leadership is the process of influencing others to work willingly toward an organizational goal with confidence. According to Asika, (2004) “leadership is generally defined simply as the process of influencing people to direct their efforts towards achievement of some particular goal or goals”.

According to Koontz et, al (1982). “Leadership is generally defined simply as the art of influencing people so that they will strive willingly towards the achievement of group goals”. ‘This concept can be seen to include not only a willingness to work but with zeal and confidence. Sikula (1996), sees “Leadership simply as an act that involves influencing others to act toward the attainment of a goal”. According to Akpala (1990) “leadership has been defined in terms of functions performance by executives as ‘individuals and as a group”.

‘This concept clarifies that the responsibility of the superior is to direct behaviour into channels that promote the achievement of organization and departmental goals. Further studies have been carried out by researchers to examine the issue of leadership.

In the view of Eze (1982) described Leadership as a relational concept involving both the influencing agent and the person being influenced. This he claimed means that without followers there could be no Leader. He further indicated that the factor which interacts to produce an effective leader include not only the abilities and characteristics of the group he is leading, but also the characteristics of the situation in which his leadership takes place. To round it up, Eze (1982) described the Nigeria leader as having authoritarian leadership characteristics and practices. They seem to maintain a rigid dictatorial approach to management as well as a master servant.

Rider horse relationship with subordinates. A Nigeria by nature and training is autocratic and demands nothing hut respect and obedience from his is subordinates.

Eze (1982), posited further that leadership particularly in the public sector becomes the ‘cradle of influence to rule enforcement and productivity, shoddiness and inefficiency, double standards, lack of seriousness and indiscipline. Okafor (1981) asserts that Nigeria leaders are tight lipped, egg heads, who clogged up the nation’s wheel of progress. He further explained that Nigerian leader in the foreign owned private sector is also an autocrat who maintains a master servant relationship with his subordinates. He equally holds the concessionary view of public office, but unlike his counterpart in the public sector, he is performance conscious, works hard to reach the target set for him by his foreign masters and is highly responsible and accountable. He does this because of his fear of dismissal and because he enjoys good working conditions and good fringe benefits. Akpala (1982) concluded that the consequences of this miserable style include the characteristic work attitude of the Nigerian work force.

### **Transactional Leadership styles**

The transactional leadership style is based on transaction or exchange. Transactional leaders offer “promise and reward for good performance” and “treat and discipline for poor performance” (Bass, 1990). Furthermore, guidance, attention and benefits are provided by the respective leader due to the follower’s positive performance. The main element of transactional leadership is directive leadership behavior (Howell & Costley, 2006).

According to Howell and Costley (2006) expectations, work procedures and methods are clearly defined and communicated to followers for completing tasks successfully and effectively. On the one hand transactional leaders make use of contingent reward behavior, providing compliments, recognition, extra time and attention but on the other hand they also make use of contingent punishment behavior for bad performance (Howell & Costley, 2006).

Another common practice of transactional leaders is the active or passive form of management-by-exception. The passive form results in “setting performance objectives and standards, waiting for problems to arise, reacting to errors and intervening reluctantly” whereas the active form of management-by-exception entails “setting performance objective and standards, monitoring for deviations and errors and then correcting them and enforcing rules and procedures” (Gill, Levine, & Pitt, 1999).

### **Transformational Leadership Styles**

Transformational leaders are defined as leaders, who positively envision the future scenarios for the organizations, engage primarily in improving employees’ self-confidence by helping them to realize their

potential, communicate an achievable mission and vision of the organizations to employees, and participate with employees to identify their needs and working out collaboratively to satisfy their needs (Peterson, Walumbwa, Byron, & Myrowitz, 2009).

Whereas transactional leadership focuses on the exchange relationship between leaders and followers, transformational leadership moves beyond these immediate self-interests (Bass, 1999). Transformational leadership emphasizes the symbolic behavior of the leader (e.g., inspirational, visionary messages; values) as opposed to economic transactions between the leader and employee (Avolio, 1999; Avolio, Bass, 1985; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Transformational leaders focus employee attention on the long-term goals of the group or organization, and instill a sense of higher purpose. Employees internalize the values championed by the leader and come to see their work as congruent with their own self-concepts (Bono & Judge, 2003; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993).

In comparison to transactional leadership, transformational leaders use charismatic behaviors extensively (Howell & Costley, 2006). Transformational leadership and charismatic leadership are often used synonymously due to the charismatic attitudes of the transformational leader (Brassey-Schouten, 2011). According to Bass and Avolio (1994), “transformational leadership is seen when leaders:

- i. Stimulate interest among colleagues and followers to view their work from new perspectives;
- ii. Generate awareness of the mission or vision of the team and organization;
- iii. Develop colleagues and followers to higher levels of ability and potential;
- iv. Motivate colleagues and followers to look beyond their own interests toward those that will benefit the group.

Transformational leaders motivate others to do more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible” (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The transformational leadership style can be divided into four dimensions: the idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Idealized influence implicates a socialized charismatic leader related to beliefs, values and missions. Idealized influence is dependent on the degree followers want to emulate the leader due to veneration, recognition and trust. Inspirational motivation bears on the degree to which leaders motive followers by challenging them, enthusiastic communication of visions, optimism and encouragement. Intellectual stimulation bears on the degree to which leaders stimulate followers to view problems from a different angle and to be innovative and creative to find solutions. Individual consideration bears to the degree to which the leader is concerned for follower’s needs and competencies and to offer a supportive environment to exploit these (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Howell & Costley, 2006). For the purpose of measuring the four dimensions of transformational leadership known as the four I’s and dimensions of other leadership styles, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is mostly applied (Bass, From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision, 1990; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). The MLQ was originated and empirically validated to measure the dimension of transactional and transformational leadership to distinguish leader behavior. Additionally, good construct validity is given by utilizing the MLQ items (Lowe & Kroeck, 1996).

Several types of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire exist but the most popular is the MLQ-5X derived by Avolio and Bass (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). As shown in the following table, the MLQ-5X measures transformational leadership by five subscales, transactional leadership by three subscales and laissez-faire leadership by one scale (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003).

### **Characteristics of Transformational Leadership**

In 1985 Bass devised the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) as an instrument intended to assess both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. MLQ was tested in numerous organizational environments involving military, educational, or commercial organizations (for more on this see Gellis, 2001). Since then MLQ has emerged as the primary means of quantitatively assessing transformational leadership (Bryant, 2003) Research (Bass, 1985b; Avolio, Bass and Jung, 1999) on the transformational leadership model suggest that transformational leadership can be conceptually organized along four cor

- i. Idealized influence designates leaders seen as role-models by followers. They are admired, respected and trusted. They inspire power and pride in their followers, by going beyond their own individual interests and focusing on the interests of the group and of its members (Bass & Avolio, 1999). Seeing them as role-models, followers want to emulate them. “There are two aspects to idealized influence: the leader’s behaviors and the elements that are attributed to the leader by followers. In addition, leaders who have a great deal of idealized influence are willing to take risks and are consistent rather than arbitrary. They can be counted on to do the right thing, demonstrating high standards of ethical and moral conduct” (Bass & Riggio, 2006).
- ii. Inspirational Motivation refers to the capacity of the leader to articulate in simple ways the goals and objectives of the group (organization). It also refers to the capacity to create a mutual understanding of what is right and what is wrong. Transformational leaders provide visions of what is possible and how to attain it. They enhance meaning and promote positive expectations about what needs to be done (Bass, 1988). Transformational leaders are able to create clear and appealing views of the future and give meaning to the work that is being done in the present. Martin Luther King’s “I have a dream” speech and US President John Kennedy’s vision of putting a man on the moon by 1970 stand out as exceptional examples of this characteristic (Yukl, 1989). Through these sorts of means, transformational leaders encourage their followers to imagine and contribute to the development of attractive, alternative futures (Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003).
- iii. Intellectual Stimulation is linked to creativity and innovation. Through intellectual stimulation, transformational leaders help followers view problems in new ways. They encourage followers to question their own beliefs, assumptions, and values, and, when appropriate, those of the leader, which may be outdated or inappropriate for solving current problems (Bass & Avolio, 1999). This is an important part of followers learning to tackle and solve problems on their own by being creative and innovative. Following new ideas and new paths of solving problems is encouraged by transformational leaders through dismantling any sanctions or fear of ridicule for new and controversial ideas (Stone, Russell & Patterson, 2003). Followers are consequently empowered to follow new paths of thought. Transformational leaders can discern, comprehend, conceptualize, and articulate to their followers the opportunities and threats facing their organization, as well as its strengths, weaknesses, and comparative advantages. It is through intellectual stimulation (of the followers) that the status quo is questioned and that new, creative methods of accomplishing the organization’s mission are explored (Bass, 1985).
- iv. Individualized Consideration means the leader is responding to each individual’s specific needs in order to include everybody in the “trans- formation” process (Simic, 1998). Followers are developed to successively higher levels of potential. The transformational leader treats each member of the group as a unique individual with specific needs, abilities and knows- ledge. Task assignment and reward distribution are done on an individual basis. An important element is the capacity of the leader to build an organizational culture that supports individual development and growth. Individual consideration can be expressed through many forms, from specific rewards or praises to individuals, career counseling, mentoring and coaching or activities with the aim of individual professional development. Bass and Riggio (2006) describe this as being “practiced when new learning opportunities are created along with a supportive climate; individual differences in terms of needs and desires are recognized and the leader’s behavior demonstrates acceptance of individual differences (e.g., some employees receive more encouragement, some more autonomy, others firmer standards, and still others more task structure)”.

Clearly then, besides having an overarching view of the organization and its trajectory, the transformational leader must also comprehend the things that motivate followers individually (Simic, 1998).

### **Laissez-Faire Leadership Style**

Laissez-faire is a French expression and signifies “leave it alone” which is addressed to the followers or work team, the followers have the total freedom to select and to set their own objectives and to monitor their own work (Kurfi, 2009). “The laissez-faire leader is one who believes in freedom of choice for the employees, leaving them alone so they can do as they want” (Goodnight, 2004). Moreover, two things are essential for the basis of laissez-faire leadership. On the one hand, as the French expression signifies, to leave the employees alone to do their jobs because of the strong belief that they know their jobs best. On the other hand the laissez-faire leadership implies that the leader does not want to exert power and control which could stoke fear (Goodnight, 2004). The main characteristics of the laissez-faire leadership style are minimal information and resources, virtually no participation, no involvement or communication and the understanding of job requirements, policies and procedures solely occur among employees (Goodnight, 2004). Thus, laissez-faire is often described as a form of “non-leadership” (Bass, 1985; Harland et al., 2005 and Kurfi, 2009) because the leader holds nearly no influence over his followers. Within the laissez-faire leadership style it is hard to identify who the leader is and who the followers are (Kurfi, Leadership Styles: The Managerial Challenges in Emerging Economies, 2009).

In conclusion and according to Ronald Goodnight (2004) the laissez-faire leadership style is manifested as the worst and less effective style of leadership, particularly with reference to the case in which the leader uses the standard practice of non-interference and “hands-off” to instruct the followers. Also, within this style of leadership the processes are out of control due to the main characteristics and the style can lead to anarchy, chaos and inefficiency and can be dismissed out of hand as useless (Goodnight, 2004). Dysfunctional conflicts and a lack of achievement are further negative consequences of laissez-faire leadership (Gill, Levine, & Pitt, 1999).

### **Organizational performance**

At the beginning of the 80s, scholars have investigated the impact of leadership and organizational performance, and in particular, Tosi (1982) expected that since transactional leaders highly concentrate on implementing strategies, improving hierarchical structure, and rewarding employee performance and exhibit active management by exception behavior to correct mistakes, they can devote significant contribution to improve organizational performance.

Leadership behaviour in general and transformational leadership in particular has long been considered an important individual factor that influences innovation and performance in the workplace (Keegan and Den Hartog, 2004; Yang et al., 2010). Further, Waldman, Ramirez, House, and Puraman (2001), based on the upper echelons theory, and proposed that transactional leadership would be positively related to organizational performance. Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam (1996) found support for this positive relationship through a meta-analysis research study. Apart from transactional leadership, it is strongly predicted that transformational leaders will have a significant contribution to improving organizational performance. They encourage employees to take the risk, and such risk-taking yields positive effects on performance under uncertain environments (Waldman, et al., 2001). They inspire and motivate employees to be innovative and to achieve difficult goals, and they insist on employees approach job problems in all the directions and discourage those using traditional methods to derive solutions. Thus it is predicted that transformational leadership will have strong and positive effects on organizational performance apart from the effects of transactional leadership on organizational performance.

### **Theoretical Literature**

### **Great-Man Theory**

The effort toward explorations for common traits of leadership is protracted over centuries as most cultures need heroes to define their successes and to justify their failures. In 1847, Thomas Carlyle stated in the best interests of the heroes that “universal history, the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at the bottom of the history of the great men who have worked here”. Carlyle claimed in his “great man theory” that leaders are born and that only those men who are endowed with heroic potentials could ever become the leaders. He opined that great men were born, not made. An American philosopher, Sidney Hook, further expanded Carlyle's perspective highlighting the impact which could be made by the eventful man vs. the event-making man (Dobbins & Platz, 1986).

He proposed that the eventful man remained complex in a historical situation, but did not really determine its course. On the other hand, he maintained that the actions of the event-making man influenced the course of events, which could have been much different, had he not been involved in the process. The event making man's role based on “the consequences of outstanding capacities of intelligence, will and character rather than the actions of distinction”. However, subsequent events unfolded that this concept of leadership was morally flawed, as was the case with Hitler, Napoleon, and the like, thereby challenging the credibility of the Great Man theory. These great men became irrelevant and consequently growth of the organizations, stifled (MacGregor, 2003). “The passing years have given the coup de grace to another force the great man who with brilliance and farsightedness could preside with dictatorial powers as the head of a growing organization but in the process retarded democratization”. Leadership theory then progressed from the dogma that leaders are born or are destined by nature to be in their role at a particular time to a reflection of certain traits that envisage a potential for leadership.

### **Style and Behavior Theory**

The style theory acknowledges the significance of certain necessary leadership skills that serve as an enabler for a leader who performs an act while drawing its parallel with a 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 a 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 a greater quantity of output. Laissez faire leadership was only considered relevant while leading a team of highly skilled and motivated people who excellent track-record, in the past.

Feidler and House (1994) identified two additional leadership styles focusing on the effectiveness of the leadership. These researchers opined that consideration (concern for people and relationship behaviors) and commencing structure (concern for production and task behaviors) were very vital variables. The consideration is referred to the amount of confidence and rapport, a leader engenders in his subordinates. Whereas, initiating structure, on the other hand, reflects the extent, to which the leader structures, directs and defines his/her own and the subordinates' roles as they have the participatory role toward organizational performance, profit and accomplishment of the mission. Different researchers proposed that three types of leaders, were; autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire. Without involving subordinates, the autocratic leader makes decisions, laissez-faire leader lets subordinates make the decision and hence takes no real leadership role other than assuming the position and the democratic leader accesses his subordinates then takes his decision. “He further assumed that all leaders could fit into one of these three categories”.

### **Empirical review**

Irshad and Hashmi's (2014) Managers' emotional intelligence (EI), organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and leadership styles play an imperative role in organizational success. The current research investigates the mediating role of EI on the relationship between OCB and transformational leadership (TL). Data has been collected from employees of the banking service sector of Pakistan. SPSS and Amos have been used to test the

hypotheses of the study in the conceptual model. The total sample size for this study is  $N=300$ . The value for Cronbach alpha is 0.907. The results provide evidence for the mediating effect of EI on the relationship between TL and OCB. The paper concludes with the discussion on results and implications for the academicians and managers.

Ghasriki and Mahmoodi (2015) investigated the relation between manager's transactional leadership style and employee's citizenship behaviour. This research used descriptive and correlational type. The population consisted of the entire employees of West Azerbaijan's department of health insurance. In order to determine the sample size, 86 individuals were selected from a population of 110 employees of west Azerbaijan's health insurance department via a simple random sampling method. Data collection instruments included a standard questionnaire of multifactor leadership style by Bass and Avolio (2000) and a questionnaire of organizational citizenship behaviour by Podsakoff. The reliability of measurement instruments was respectively 0.91 and 0.80 and calculated via Cronbach's alpha. For data analysis, the Pearson correlation test, multivariate regression test and independent t test were used. Results indicated that there is a significant relation between transactional leadership style and employee's organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). There is also a significant relation among all elements of the transactional leadership style and elements of OCB.

Chamariyah, and Noermijati (2015) assessed the perception of ties between variables transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour and performance of employees at PT. PLN (Persero) Pamekasan Area, Madura. This study aims to determine the effect of variable transformational leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour and performance of employees. This research was done at PT. PLN (Persero) Pamekasan Area, Madura using saturated sampling. Analysis techniques using GSCA through 54 permanent employees. The results showed that: Transformational leadership on OCB significant effect with coefficient of 0.410), OCB significant effect on employee performance, with the value of the coefficients of 0.435), Transformational leadership significantly influence employee performance through OCB with coefficient of 0.248), Transformational leadership on employee performance through OCB very significant effect on the value of the coefficient of 0.609. Transformational leadership on OCB effect, OCB proved to improve employee performance, Transformational leadership has significant influence employee performance through OCB and OCB as a mediating variable between transformational leadership on employee performance and has a very significant value to increase employee performance.

Schnake and Dumler (1993) examined the relationship between leader behaviour and organisational citizenship behaviour and found out that traditional leadership (characterised by the limitation of employee discretion) to contribute more to the prediction of organisational citizenship behaviour than servant leadership (characterised by employee autonomy and control).

Avolio and Gardner (2005) distinguished, authentic leaders, in contrast to transformational leaders might or might not be actively or proactively focused on developing followers into leaders, even though they need a positive impact on them via role modeling.

Bass and Steidlmeier (1990) noted that like authentic leadership, each servant and spiritual leadership include either explicit or implicit recognition of leader self-awareness or the focus on integrity, trust, courage, and hope. However, in servant and spiritual leadership, these constructs have remained mostly a theoretical phenomenon and have not been supported by empirical research. Let be completely clear: authenticity is not the product of pure manipulation. It accurately reflects aspects of the leader's inner self; therefore it can't be an act. However great leaders appear to grasp which temperament traits they ought to disclose to whom and when. They are like chameleons, capable of adapting to the demands of the situations they face and therefore the people they lead, yet they do not lose their identities within the process. Authentic leaders stay centered on wherever they are going however never lose sight of where they came from. Highly attuned to their environments, they consider an intuition born of formative, generally harsh experiences to grasp the expectations and considerations of the people they seek to influence. They maintain their distinctiveness as individuals, however they know how to

win acceptance in strong corporate and social cultures and the way to use elements of these cultures as a basis for radical modification.

Akinbode and Fagbohunge (2012) examined the relationship between leadership-behaviour and organizational factors as predictors of workers' organizational commitment. Ex-Post-Factor research design was employed. A total number of 504 workers selected from private and public sector organizations located in Lagos and Abuja in Nigeria participated in the study. The study was anchored on Graen and Scandura Leader-member exchange theory. It was hypothesized that job tenure, management cadre and organizational type would significantly predict workers' organizational commitment. Also, workers who perceived their bosses to be high on interpersonal relations and emancipatory leadership behaviour will identify more with their organization, demonstrate high loyalty and show high commitment to their organizations. Results revealed a positive progression in the influence of organizational factors on organizational commitment variables. Specifically, junior workers reported more commitment compared to senior management level workers for at least 1.03 times. Interpersonal relations contributed about 19.9% of the total variance of the observed job identification and 28.8% to workers' job loyalty, and 19.3% to organizational commitment respectively. Emancipatory leadership-behaviour contributed 17.2% and 10.2% to loyalty and organizational commitment. Autocratic/control contributed 19.3% to the observed variance in job involvement. Meanwhile, autocratic/control leadership-behaviour accounted for about 15.4% of workers' disloyalty to their organizations. Findings in the study were discussed in the light of emergent literature on leadership and organizational research.

Elencov (2002) examined the influence of the role of leadership style on 350 private companies in Russia and found a significant relationship between transformational leadership style on employee performance. The results of empirical research by Vigoda, et al (2005) examined 201 employees in the public security organizations in Israel also strengthens research by Elencov, (2002), which explains the existence of a significant relationship between transformational leadership style on employee performance. Different from Rowold (2009) which examines the relationship of transformational leadership style on employee performance in the German fire department with a sample of 283 employees; found a significant relationship between transformational leadership style on employee performance. This is not in line with the results of empirical research Griffith, (2004), which explains the significant influence of leadership style on employee performance. Likewise Risambessy (2010) in his research, produces a significant relationship between transformational leadership on employee performance. In contrast to the results of research conducted Suspend (2012) carried out a research to explain the existence of a significant relationship between transformational leadership style on employee performance, unless assisted by mediating variables that employee motivation.

Lee, Kim and Kim, (2013) investigated the effects of procedural justice, transformational leadership, and complexity which are directed at the organization as a whole on OCB. Also investigated was the relationship between OCB and job satisfaction. From a sample of 1,100 employees from 30 companies in the Korea National Industrial Complex, we tested the hypothesized model using structural equation modeling. The major findings are as follows: The findings showed that procedural justice, transformational leadership, and complexity had a positive effect on employees' OCB and that OCB is also positively related to job satisfaction. Originality/value: The results suggest that employees could be engaged in organizational citizenship behaviour when they perceive the fairness of the decision-making process, receive leaders' support, and recognize less complexity of the organizational process.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### 3.1 Research Design

The research design to be adopted for this study is a descriptive survey design. The case study design was preferred because it is effective for collecting in depth information within a short time and facilitates understanding of a population from a small part of it (Mugenda & Mugenda 2003). It is also suitable for

studying a single entity, (Oso & Onen, 2005 & Koul, 1992). The empirical data for the study shall be collected through a well-structured questionnaire, which was prepared and distributed among the respondents of Small and Medium Scale enterprises in Irepodun./Ifelodun Local Government Area of Ekiti State.

### 3.2 Population of the Study

The population for the study comprises 98 SMEs operators from sixteen selected SMEs in Irepodun/Ifelodun local government area, namely automobile industry, bakery, block industry, catering/rental, car wash, cassava processing industry, dry cleaning laundry, furniture, metal fabrication, Palm Oil, panel beating, printing press, rental services, Rice mill, and saw mill. The selected SMEs are as follows:

**Table 3.1: Population of the Study**

S/N	Names of the SMEs	No of the SMEs
1	Automobile Industry	3
2	Bakery	4
3	Block Industry	13
4	Catering/Rental	5
5	Car wash	1
6	Cassava Processing Industry	1
7	Dry Cleaning Laundry	2
8	Furniture Industry	11
9	Metal Fabrication	9
10	Palm Oil Industry	11
11	Panel Beating/Spraying	5
12	Poultry Farm	1
13	Printing Press	1
14	Rental Services	4
15	Rice Mill	15
16	Saw Mill	12
	Total	98

Source: The Ministry of Commerce, Industries and Cooperatives, Ado- Ekiti, Ekiti State

### 3.3 Sample size and Sampling method

To determine sample size and sampling technique, the statistical formula applied to determine the sample size from the population of the study as formulated by Yamane (1967) cited in Israel (2009) is stated as follows:

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

Where n = anticipated total sample size; N = population size; e = error term (0.05)

Therefore, the sample size is calculated thus

$$n = \frac{98}{1 + 98(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = 79$$

From the above, the sample size of the study is 79 respondents.

For effective coverage, a stratified sampling technique was used to select the participating employees. The entire population was stratified into two strata based on the category of employees. Thus we have senior non- teaching and junior non- teaching staff. Taro (1976) model was used to calculate the sample size of each stratum as below:

$$n = \frac{n_i N_i}{N}$$

Where n = number of respondents from each category of employees, ni = total sample size,

Ni= number in

each group, N = population size of the study

Therefore:

**Table 3.2: Stratified Sample size**

S/N	Names of the SMEs	No of the SMEs	Sample
1	Automobile Industry	3	$\frac{(3)(79)}{98} = 2$
2	Bakery	4	$\frac{(4)(79)}{98} = 3$
3	Block Industry	13	$\frac{(13)(79)}{98} = 10$
4	Catering/Rental	5	$\frac{(5)(79)}{98} = 4$
5	Car wash	1	$\frac{(1)(79)}{98} = 1$
6	Cassava Processing Industry	1	$\frac{(1)(79)}{98} = 1$
7	Dry Cleaning Laundry	2	$\frac{(2)(79)}{98} = 2$
8	Furniture Industry	11	$\frac{(11)(79)}{98} = 9$
9	Metal Fabrication	9	$\frac{(9)(79)}{98} = 7$
10	Palm Oil Industry	11	$\frac{(11)(79)}{98} = 9$
11	Panel Beating/Spraying	5	$\frac{(5)(79)}{98} = 4$
12	Poultry Farm	1	$\frac{(1)(79)}{98} = 1$
13	Printing Press	1	$\frac{(1)(79)}{98} = 1$
14	Rental Services	4	$\frac{(4)(79)}{98} = 3$
15	Rice Mill	15	$\frac{(15)(79)}{98} = 12$
16	Saw Mill	12	$\frac{(12)(79)}{98} = 10$
	Total	98	79

**Sources of data Collection**

This study used the primary source of data collection. The questionnaire was structured on a 5 point Likert scale. The scoring range for the scale will be Agree (1); Strongly Agree (2); Undecided (3); Disagree (4); and Strongly Disagree (5) for negatively structured questions, the scoring range will reverse.

**Method of data collection**

The study will rely on primary data which were generated through a structured questionnaire administered among the selected Small and medim scale enterprises in the Irepodun/Ifelodun local government area of Ekiti State. However, the data that were collected from the field shall be sorted, coded and analysed using regression analysis.

**Validity and Reliability of data Instrument**

The questionnaires to be used to measure transactional leadership, transformational leadership, laissez faire leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour, being adapted instruments, were subjected to pre-testing for their validity and reliability. For each of the instruments that were used to test re-test should match the cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient as follows:

**Table 3.3: Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments**

Variable	No. of	Cronbach Alpha	Reference
----------	--------	----------------	-----------

	items		
Transactional leadership	12	0.812	Hakkaka, and Baramond (2014)
Transformational leadership	21	0.84	Lee1, Kim and Kim (2013)
Laissez faire leadership	4	0.88	Bass and Avolio (1997)
Organisational Performance	6	0.74	Meierhans, Rietmann and Jonas (2008)

Source: Various authors

### Measurement of variables

For those variables that have been employed in previous research, measures are adopted if they satisfy acceptable measurement quality. For those without extant measures, new measures are developed for the study according to the procedures suggested by Churchill (1979) and Nunnally and Bernstein (2004). The transactional leadership styles instrument was used in this study as adopted from Lee, Kim and Kim, (2013). This scale consists of 12 items comprises of Management by exception passive, Management by exception active, and Contingent reward. The transformational leadership style variable of the study shall be assessed using five items adapted from Hakkaka, and Baramond (2014). Organisational Performance variable of the study shall be assessed using nine items adapted from Meierhans, Rietmann and Jonas (2008).

### Method of data analysis

To achieve the set objectives and hypotheses, both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed. In the descriptive analysis, the use of percentages came to bare; more importantly in the areas of the frequency of respondents to their views on the questions of the research instrument. In specific terms, to achieve objectives I, II and III multiple regression analysis shall be employed to test the hypotheses.

## 4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Demographic Distribution of Respondents

Table 4.1 revealed the demographic distribution of respondents, the Gender distribution showed that thirty-four (44.7%) of the respondents are male while forty-two (55.3%) of the respondents are female which revealed that more female is in small and medium scale enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun local government area in Ekiti State.

Age distribution of respondents showed that fourteen (18.4%) out of seventy-six are between the age of 21-30years, eleven (14.5%) are between the age of 31-40years, eighteen (23.7%) are between the age of 41-50years while thirty-three (43.4%) are 51years and above. This implies that 51years and above are more than other age categories in the age bracket of the respondents. The marital status of the respondents revealed that twenty-three (30.3%) of the respondents are single while fifty-three (69.7%) of the respondents are married.

Educational qualification of respondents of the people that filled the questionnaire showed that twenty-three (30.3%) are with B.Sc./HND certificates, forty-seven (61.8%) are ND/NCE holders while six (7.9%) are with masters and above certificates. This implies that the majority of the people in Irepodun/Ifelodun in small and medium scale enterprises are learner people.

**Table 4.1: Demographic Distribution of Respondents**

	Frequency	Percent
Gender Distribution		
Male	34	44.7
Female	42	55.3
Total	76	100.0
Age Distribution		
21-30Years	14	18.4
31-40Years	11	14.5
41-50 Years	18	23.7
51 Years and Above	33	43.4
Total	76	100.0

Marital Status		
Single	23	30.3
Married	53	69.7
Total	76	100.0
Educational Qualification		
B.Sc./HND	23	30.3
ND/NCE	47	61.8
Masters and Above	6	7.9
Total	76	100.0

## Hypotheses Testing

### Hypothesis One

*There is no significant effect of transformational leadership styles on the performance of small and medium enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti*

To test this hypothesis, the respondents' scores on six variables (intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, idealized influence attribute, idealized influence behaviour) on the performance of small and medium scale enterprises were computed and subjected to multiple regression analysis. From Table 4.2, the R (correlation Coefficient) gives a positive value of 0.924; this indicates that there is a very strong and positive relationship between transactional leadership styles and performance of SMEs. The  $R^2$  is a portion of the total variation in the dependent variable that is explained by the variation in the independent variables. From the results obtained,  $R^2$  is equal to 0.854, this implies that intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, idealized influence attribute, idealized influence behaviour brought about 85.4% variance in performance of SMEs in Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti State, this is further proven by the adjusted  $R^2$  that shows the goodness of fit of the model which gives a value of 0.843, implying that when all errors are corrected and adjustments are made the model can only account for 84.3% by transactional leadership styles while the remaining 15.7% is explained by the error term in the model.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of Intellectual stimulation is -0.779 with  $t = -1.477$  and ( $p = 0.144 > 0.05$ ). These results showed that Intellectual stimulation has an effect on the performance of SMEs. It is found insignificant; therefore we accept the null hypothesis and reject an alternative hypothesis. This implies that they do not suggest new ways of looking at how to compete with others in the same business, also failed to seek differing perspectives when solving a problem.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of certificate of recognition is 0.538 with  $t = 0.458$  and ( $p = 0.00 < 0.05$ ). These results showed that inspirational motivation has a positive relationship with the performance of SMEs. It was not found significant; therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. This implies that they talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished and articulates a compelling vision of the future.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of Individualized consideration is 1.277 with  $t = 0.953$  and ( $p = 0.02 < 0.05$ ). These results showed that Individualized consideration has a positive relationship with the performance of SMEs. It was not found significant; therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. This implies that they spend time teaching and coaching, treats as an individual rather than just a member of the group.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of Idealized influence attributed is 1.377 with  $t = 0.000$  and ( $p = 0.100 > 0.05$ ). These results showed that the Idealized influence attributed has a positive relationship with the performance of SMEs. It was not found significant; therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. This implies that they emphasis the important of having a collective sense of mission and also considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of Idealized influence behavior is 7.406 with  $t= 0.000$  and ( $p= 0.100 > 0.05$ ). These results showed that Idealized influence behavior has a positive relationship with the performance of SMEs. It was not found significant; therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. This implies that the business owners of small and medium scale enterprises in the area do not go beyond self-interest for the good of the business and also don not displays a sense of power and confidence, in addition, they do not act in ways that build customer respect.

**Table 4.2: Estimated effect of transformational leadership styles on performance**

Variables	Coeff.	Std. Error	t-value	Sig.
Constant	-.332	.281	-1.184	.241
Intellectual stimulation	-.779	.527	-1.477	.144
Inspirational motivation	.538	.113	.458	.000
Individualized consideration	1.277	.390	.953	.002
Idealized influence attributed	1.377	.411	.000	1.000
Idealized influence behavior	-7.406	.411	.000	1.000
R	0.924			
R Square	0.854			
Adjusted R Square	0.843			
F-Stat.	81.617(0.000)			

Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance

### Hypothesis Two

*There is no significant effect of transactional leadership styles and performance of small and medium enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti*

To test this hypothesis, the respondents’ scores on three variables (Management by exception passive, Management by exception active, Contingent rewarding) on the performance of SMEs were computed and subjected to multiple regression analysis. From Table 4.3, the R (correlation Coefficient) gives a positive value of 0.952; this indicates that there is a very strong and positive relationship between transactional leadership styles and performance of SMEs. The  $R^2$  is a portion of the total variation in the dependent variable that is explained by the variation in the independent variables. From the results obtained,  $R^2$  is equal to 0.905, this implies that Management by exception passive, Management by exception active and Contingent rewarding brought about 90.5% variance in performance of SMEs in Ifelodun/Irepodun Local Government area of Ekiti State, this is further proven by the adjusted  $R^2$  that shows the goodness of fit of the model which gives a value of 0.901, implying that when all errors are corrected and adjustments are made the model can only account for 90.1% by transactional leadership styles while the remaining 9.9% is explained by the error term in the model.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of Management by exception passive is 1.736 with  $t= 8.596$  and ( $p= 0.000 < 0.05$ ). These results showed that Management by exception passive has greater and a positive relationship with the performance of SMEs. It was found significant; therefore, we accept alternative hypotheses and reject the null hypothesis. This implies that they demonstrate that problems must become chronic before taking action and fails to interfere until problems become serious.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of Management by exception active is -0.038 with  $t= -0.211$  and ( $p= 0.834 > 0.05$ ). These results showed that Management by exception active has an effect on the performance of SMEs. It is found insignificant; therefore we accept the null hypothesis and reject alternative hypothesis. This suggests that they direct their attention toward failures to meet standards and also concentrate their full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of Contingent rewarding is 0.038 with  $t= -5.552$  and ( $p= 0.00 < 0.05$ ). These results showed that Contingent rewarding have an effect on the performance of SMEs. It is found significant; therefore we accept alternative hypotheses and reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that they provide their customers with assistance in exchange for their efforts and in addition discussed in specific terms which are responsible for achieving performance targets.

**Table 4.3: Estimated effect of transformational leadership styles and performance**

Variables	Coeff.	Std. Error	t-value	Sig.
Constant	-.245	.225	-1.087	.280
Management by exception passive	1.736	.202	8.596	.000
Management by exception active	-.038	.180	-.211	.834
Contingent rewarding	-.657	.118	-5.552	.000
R	0.952			
R Square	0.905			
Adjusted R Square	0.901			
F- Stat.	229.578(0.000)			

### Hypothesis Three

*There is no significant influence of laissez faire leadership style on the performance of small and medium enterprises in Irepodun/Ifelodun Local Government of Ekiti*

To test this hypothesis, the respondents' scores on three variables Laissez -Faire Leadership on the performance of SMEs were computed and subjected to simple regression analysis. From Table 4.4, the R (correlation Coefficient) gives a positive value of 0.731; this indicates that there is a very strong and positive relationship between Laissez -Faire Leadership and performance of SMEs. The  $R^2$  is a portion of the total variation in the dependent variable that is explained by the variation in the independent variables. From the results obtained,  $R^2$  is equal to 0.631, this implies that Laissez -Faire Leadership brought about 63.1% variance in performance of SMEs in Ifelodun/Irepodun Local Government of Ekiti, this is further proven by the adjusted  $R^2$  that shows the goodness of fit of the model which gives a value of 0.626, implying that when all errors are corrected and adjustments are made the model can only account for 94.7% by Laissez -Faire Leadership while the remaining 37.4% is explained by the error term in the model.

The unstandardized beta co-efficient of Laissez -Faire Leadership is 1.114 with  $t= 11.259$  and ( $p= 0.000 < 0.05$ ). These results showed that Laissez -Faire Leadership has a positive relationship with the performance of SMEs. It was found significant; therefore, we accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. This implies that they avoid getting involved in important decisions.

**Table 4.4: Estimated effect of laissez faire leadership style and performance**

Variables	Coeff.	Std. Error	t-value	Sig.
Constant	-.711	.405	-1.755	.083
Laissez -Faire Leadership	1.114	.099	11.259	.000
R	.795			
R Square	.631			
Adjusted R Square	.626			
F-Stat.	126.767(.000)			

Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance

## 5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Conclusion

Based on the findings, it is concluded that they do not suggest new ways of looking at how to compete with others in the same business, also failed to seek differing perspectives when solving problem, talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished and articulates a compelling vision of the future, they spend time teaching and coaching, treats as an individual rather than just a member of the group, emphasis the important of having a collective sense of mission and also considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions, the business owners of small and medium scale enterprises in the area do not go beyond self-interest for the good of the business and also don not displays a sense of power and confidence, in addition, do not acts

in ways that build customer respect, they demonstrate that problems must become chronic before taking action and fails to interfere until problems become serious, direct their attention toward failures to meet standards and also concentrate their full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures and provides their customers with assistance in exchange for their efforts and in addition discussed in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance target.

## 5.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to the management of the small and medium scale enterprises in Ekiti and Nigeria at large that are interested in modifying their leadership styles and performance:

The study recommended that since the transactional leadership is based on contingent reward and performance, therefore managers should positively reward the employees with praise or recognition when they perform at or above expectations. Similarly, the negative rewarding approach should also be used in the form of correction, coercion, criticism, and/or other forms of punishment, when performance is below the expected standard.

Finally, the results of this study present useful information for organizations involved in the education industry to promote leadership behaviours which could impact the organisational commitment as a significant role player in securing staff satisfaction and ensuring institutional success.

## REFERENCES

- i. Akinbode, G.A., & Fagbohunge, O.B. (2012). *Leadership and Organizational Factors as Predictors of Employees Organisational Commitment in Nigeria: An Empirical Analysis*. *Business and Management Research*, 1 (2), 69-87.
- ii. Abraham, R. (1999). *Emotional intelligence in organisations: a conceptualization*. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monograph*, 125(2), 209-219.
- iii. Agho, A. P. (1992). *Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negativity*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65 (3), 185-196.
- iv. Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1995). *An investigation of female and male constructs of leadership and empowerment*. *Women in Management Review*, 10 (2), 3-8.
- v. Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Walumbwa, F., & May, D. (2004). *Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviours*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823.
- vi. Avolio, B.J., & Gardner, W.L. (2005). *Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315-338.
- vii. Bachman, J. S. (2000). *Emotional intelligence in the collection of debt*. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8 (3), 176-82.
- viii. Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E.K. (2000). *Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study*. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 21, 157-161.
- ix. Baron, R. A. (1986). *The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (6), 1173-82.
- x. Bass, B. A. (1990). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Consulting. Psychologist press, Palo Alto, CA.
- xi. Bass, B. M. (1997). *Full range Leadership Development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, Palo Mindgarden Alto' CA.
- xii. Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). *Core self-evaluations: A review of the trait and its role in job satisfaction and job performance*. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, S5-S18.
- xiii. Bycio, P. H. (1995). *Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership*. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 80 (4), 468-78.
- xiv. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). *A theory of performance*. In E. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations*, 35–70.

- xv. Chamariyah, A.S., & Noermijati, R. (2015). *The Effect of Transformational Leadership to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and Employees' Performance (Study Case to PT. PLN (Persero) Pamekasan Area)*. *International Journal of Business and Behavioural Sciences* 5(4), 1-9.
- xvi. Cooper, R. A. (1997). *Executive EQ: EI in Leadership and Organisations*, Grosset, Putnum New York, NY.
- xvii. Day, A.L. & Carroll, S.A. (2004). *Using an ability-based measure of EI to predict subordinate's performance, group performance, and group citizenship behaviours*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36 (6), 1443-58.
- xviii. Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A., Schroeder, D.A., & Penner, L.A. (2006). *The social psychology of prosocial behaviour*.
- xix. Duckett, H. & Macfarlane, E. (2003). *Emotional intelligence and transformational leadership in retailing*, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24 (6), 309- 317.
- xx. Finkelstein, M.A. (2006). *Dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour: Motives, motive fulfillment and role identity*. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 34(6), 603-616.
- xxi. Finkelstein, M.A., & Penner, L.A. (2004). *Predicting organizational citizenship behaviour: Integrating the functional and role identity approaches*. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 32(4), 383-398.
- xxii. Fu, P.P., Chow, H.S. & Zhang, Y. (2001). *Leadership approaches and perceived leadership effectiveness in Chinese township and village enterprise*, *Journal of Asian Business*, 17 (1), 1-12.
- xxiii. Gardner, L. & Stough, C. (2002). *Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers*. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23 (2), 68-78.
- xxiv. Gardner, W.L., Avolio, B.J., Luthans, F., May, D.R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). —*Can you see the real me? A self-based model of authentic leaders and follower development*. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 343-372.
- xxv. Gates, G. (1995). *A review of literature on leadership and emotional: exposing theory, posing questions, and forwarding an agenda*.
- xxvi. George, J.M. (1995). *Leader positive mood and group performance: the case of customer service*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25 (9), 778-94.
- xxvii. Ghasriki, H.Y. & Mahmoodi, A. (2015). *Discussing the relation between Transactional Leadership Style and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (Case Study: West Azerbaijan's Department of Health Insurance)*. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 5 (1), 3166-3171.
- xxviii. Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- xxix. Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- xxx. Goleman, D. (1998). *What makes a leader?* *Harvard Business Review*, 76 (6), November-December, 93-102.
- xxxii. Hater, J.J. & Bass, B.M. (1988). *Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(4), 695-702.
- xxxiii. Higgs, M. (2003). *How can we make sense of leadership in the 21st century?* *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(5), 273-84.
- xxxiiii. Higgs, M. (2004). *A study of the relationship between emotional intelligence and performance in UK call centers*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(4), 442-454.
- xxxv. Irshad, R., & Hashmi, M.S. (2014). *How Transformational Leadership is related to Organizational Citizenship Behaviour? The Mediating Role of Emotional Intelligence*. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 8 (2), 413 – 425.
- xxxvi. Judge, T.A. & Bono, J.E. (2000). *Five factor model of personality and transformational leadership*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751-765.
- xxxvii. Krishnan, V.R. (2005). *Transformational leadership and outcomes: role of relationship duration*. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(6), 442-457.
- xxxviii. Kupers, W. & Weibler, J. (2006). *How emotional is transformational leadership really?* *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(5), 368-383.

- xxxviii. Langhorn, S. (2004). *How emotional intelligence can improve management performance. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(4), 220-30.
- xxxix. *Linking EI, spirituality and workplace performance. Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(3), 203-218.
- xl. Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership development. In K.S. Cameron, J.E., Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), Positive organizational scholarship. Foundations of a new discipline*, 241-259.
- xli. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Dionne, S.D., Yammarino, F.J., Atwater, L.E. and Spangler, W.D. (2004). *Transformational leadership and team performance, Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(2), 177-93.
- xlii. Martinez, M.N. (1997). *The smarts that count. HR Magazine*, 42 (11), 72-78.
- xliii. Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. (2005). *Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 874 – 888.
- xliv. Meyer, J.P., Paunonen, S.V., Gellatly, I.R., Goffin, R.D. & Jackson, D.N. (1989), *Organizational commitment and job performance: it's the nature of the commitment that counts. Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(1), 152-156.
- xlv. Moriano, J.A., Molero, F., & Lévy-Mangin, J.P. (2011). *Liderazgo auténtico. Concepto y validación del cuestionario ALQ en España. Authentic leadership. Concept and validation of the ALQ in Spain. Psicothema*, 23(2), 336-341.
- xlvi. Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.*
- xlvii. Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. London: Sage.*
- xlviii. Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z. & Stough, C. (2001). *Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22 (1), 5-10.
- xlix. Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & Blume, B.D. (2009). *Individual and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviours: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141.
- i. Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & Mackenzie, S. B. (1997). *Organisational citizenship behaviour and the quantity and quality of work group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 262-270.
- ii. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). *Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- iii. Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.C., Lee, J. & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). *Common method biases in behavioural research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- iiii. Rahim, M.A. & Minors, P. (2003). *Effects of EI on concern for quality and problem solving. Managerial Auditing Journal*, 18(2), 150-5.
- liv. Rob Goffee & Gareth Jones. (2005). *Managing Authenticity: The Paradox of Great Leadership. Harvard Business Revi*, 87-94
- lv. Rosete, D. & Ciarrochi, J. (2005). *Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness. Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26 (5), 388- 99.
- lvi. Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). *Emotional Intelligence. Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9 (3), 185-211.
- lvii. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler. Leban, W. & Zulauf, C. (2004). *Linking emotional intelligence abilities and transformational leadership styles. Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25 (7), 554-64.
- lviii. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass. Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G., & Avey, J. (2009). *Authentic leadership and positive psychological capital: The mediating role of trust at the group level of analysis. Organizational Studies*, 15(3), 227-240.

- lix. Sivanathan, N. & Fekken, G.C. (2002). *Emotional intelligence, moral reasoning and transformational leadership. Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23 (4), 198-204.
- lx. Sternberg, R.J. (1996). *Successful Intelligence*. New York:Simon and Schuster.
- lxi. Walumbwa, F.O. & Lawler, J.J. (2003). *Building effective organisations: transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes and withdrawal behaviours in three emerging economies. The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(7), 1083-110.
- lxii. Walumbwa, F.O., Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Wernsing, T.S., & Peterson, S.J. (2008). *Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89-126.
- lxiii. Walumbwa, F.O., Lawler, J.J., Avolio, B.J., Wang, P. & Shi, K. (2005). *Transformational leadership and work-related attitudes: the moderating effects of collective and self-efficacy across cultures. Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, 11 (3), 1- 16.
- lxiv. Walumbwa, F.O., Wang, P., Wang, H., Schaubroeck, J., & Avolio, B.J. (2010). *Psychological processes linking authentic leadership to follower behaviours. The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 901-914.
- lxv. Williams, L.J., & Anderson, S.E. (1991). *Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting. Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 1(3), 601-617.
- lxvi. Wong, C.A., & Cummings, G.G. (2009). *The influence of authentic leadership behaviours on trust and work outcomes of health care staff. Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(2), 6-23.
- lxvii. Wong, C.S. & Law, K.S. (2002). *The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: an exploratory study. Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 243- 274.
- lxviii. Meierhans, D., Rietmann, B. and Jonas, K. (2008). *Influence of Fair and Supportive Leadership Behavior on Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Swiss Journal of Psychology* 67 (3), 131–141.
- lxix. Lee, U.H., Kim H.K., and Kim, Y.H. (2013). *Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Its Outcomes. Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, (5)1, 54-65.
- lxx. Hakkaka, & Baramond (2014). *The relationship between the leadership styles and Organizational citizenship behaviour. Reef Resources Assessment and Management Technical Paper*, 40 (4), 262-268.