

# **LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR AND EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION AMONG PARAMILITARY WORKERS IN BENIN CITY, EDO STATE.**

**NWAGBOSO, IFEYINWA ROSE**

Department of Management,  
Faculty of Management Sciences,  
University of Port Harcourt,  
Nigeria.

**PROFESSOR B. C. ONUOHA**

(Professor of Entrepreneurship & General Management)

Department of Management,  
Faculty of Management Sciences,  
University of Port Harcourt,  
Nigeria.

**DR. J. O. AKHIGBE**

(Senior Lecturer)

Department of Management,  
Faculty of Management Sciences,  
University of Port Harcourt,  
Nigeria.

## **ABSTRACT**

We investigated the relationship between leadership behaviour (Independent variable) and employee job satisfaction (Dependent Variable) among selected paramilitary workers in Benin City of Edo State. We used a random sampling technique, which we distributed 200 questionnaires, 113 retrieved as valid. It was found that noticeable leadership behaviours were transformational & transactional and the employees were to an average extent satisfied with their work.

**Keywords:** Leadership Behaviour, Employee Job Satisfaction, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Laissez Faire Leadership, Extrinsic, Intrinsic, Productivity.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The fundamental factors influencing the effectiveness of an organization are leadership and employee job satisfaction (Tordera et al. (2008). That is, leadership is considered one of the most important determinants of employees' job satisfaction. It extensively influences employees' motivation and dedication. An organization is a social place where human resource plays a very significant role in effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. Effective leaders and employees are those who give great help to any organization to achieve its objectives and goals.

Their personal effort and commitment with organization is that which help organization to succeed.

Many observations, academic documents and circles agreed that leadership have great impact on job satisfaction of any employee. Organizations always try to earn more profit; which is related to productivity of firms. And productivity of any firm is increased by its employee. So for the satisfaction of employees, organization takes many steps, one of such steps is to provide the best manager or supervisor who trains the employees to give the best output in the organization because coordination with manager and employee is very important to fulfil any task at a given time.

Since organizations are social systems and human resources are the most important factors of the organizational efficiency and effectiveness, these changes and developments have implications both for the corporation and their leaders. Tordera et al. (2008) considers leadership as an important construct for the positive work outcomes which ensures a satisfied and motivated workforce. While, Vecchio et al., (2008) believe that in the path-goal theory, leadership has been recommended as an antecedent to several workplace outcomes such as subordinates' job satisfaction.

Broadly speaking, leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers to perform in such a way that it will reach a defined goal or goals (Bennis and Nanus 1985; Burns 1978). What is meant by influence is that the relationship among people is not passive but multidirectional instead; superiors influence subordinates and subordinates influence superiors. Leadership should be differentiated from Management. Whereas managers are concerned with short-term problems within an organization, management effectiveness is measured in terms of how effectively the group accomplishes its goals. It involves the interaction and successful implementation of all four functions which are: decision making, goal attainment, integration and group maintenance.

Leadership is most often viewed as the *influence* function of Management. However, leadership effectiveness is measured in terms of how successful the leader is in motivating behaviour despite resistance. Leaders adopt a much broader perspective. While early leadership theories concentrated on the characteristics of successful leaders, their traits, behaviour, power, influence and situational approaches (e.g. Likert 1967; Mintzberg 1973; McClelland and Burnham 1976), recent ones have focused on the role of followers and the correlated nature of leadership. Leadership theories have proposed several leadership behaviours such as autocratic, bureaucratic, charismatic, democratic, participative, situational, transformational, transactional and laissez-faire. In the course of this study; transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership will be used.

While the transactional approach has been the staple of supervisors and managers in the business sector (because of the availability of pay as a reward), leaders in not-for-profit and volunteer organizations have long relied on transformational approaches. However, business leaders are discovering the limitation of using transactional approaches alone, as more and more constraints are being placed upon them with respect to the distribution of extrinsic rewards.

Laissez-faire leadership on the other hand, is a passive kind of approach. There is no relationship exchange between the leader and the followers. It represents a non-transactional kind of

approach in which necessary decisions are not made, actions are delayed, leadership responsibilities ignored, and authority unused.

A leader displaying this form of non-leadership attitude is perceived as not caring at all about others. Therefore, the independent variable (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership behaviour) has a correlation with the dependent variables which may be intrinsic or extrinsic. (i.e. achievement, recognition, responsibility, pay, promotion and supervision). The presence of intrinsic-motivation facilitates higher satisfaction and performance; whereas the absence of extrinsic factors alleviates dissatisfaction.

**Knowledge Gap:** From the above discussion, evidence indicates that there has been little done as regards the examination of the study variables within the context of Nigeria (Aremu, 2003; Adebule, 2004); this is as most of the researches on the constructs have been carried out on foreign companies and have been based on the organizational structure and workings of international firms and corporations; however to fill the gap, this study intends to investigate the relationship between the leadership behaviour and employee job satisfaction within the Nigerian socio-economic and socio-cultural context. The study will achieve this by examining the dimensions of leadership behaviour and how these dimensions are related to the measures of employee job satisfaction; hence, it is on this premise therefore, that the researcher wishes to test the effect of leadership behaviour on employee job satisfaction among Paramilitary in Benin City-Edo State, Nigeria.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Research reveals the following challenges with respect to job satisfaction:

Aremu (2003) observed that poor attitude which most often is a reflection of a lack of job satisfaction; can be described as a performance that is viewed or perceived by management, peers and customers as being below an expected standard. Outcomes such as recklessness, disregard for the assets and properties of the organization, unnecessary conflict and confrontation over mild and negligible issues as well as waste and nonchalance can be linked to instances of poor employee contentment and satisfaction with jobs and role expectations.

Adebule (2004) observed that in most Nigerian public institutions and parastatals, workers displayed varying levels of job satisfaction or discontentment which were often accompanied by absenteeism, poor attention to details and an overall display of irresponsibility towards duties and task.

Kyko (2005) identified six (6) main factors which lead to a workplace toxicity which further degenerates into low productivity of workers; disenchantment with roles and poor interest with regards to organizational goals and objectives. These factors include: biased leadership, opaque management, inequity of company's policies, poor working conditions and environment, lack of adequate communication as well as inadequate staff compensation.

Weiss (2002) observed that job satisfaction is an attitude but however opines that studies should endeavor to differentiate objects associated with cognitive evaluation such as beliefs, affections and behaviour; the argument follows that individuals (especially as relates to employees) form attitudes towards roles and jobs by taking into cognizance feelings, behaviour as well as beliefs; hence, Job satisfaction can be ascribed as broader range of issues which are concerned with the

employees' work experience, encapsulating working conditions, relationship with peers, subordinates and superiors as well as their quality of working life.

Aremu (2010) emphasized that poor attitude was not only frustrating to the management as well as other stakeholders but that its pervading effect was also as grievous to the entire society in terms of the dearth of manpower and skill in various spheres of the Nigerian economy and politics.

Therefore hinged on this identified problem statement, this study empirically seeks to ascertain the relationship between leadership behaviour and job satisfaction within the moderating effect of employee productivity.

## II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study on the relationship between leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction shall contribute significantly both theoretically and practically in the following ways:

**Theoretically:** The work will serve as a reference point for academic purposes, to subsequent researchers including students, lecturers, states, and other federal and government ministries or parastatals, as well as employers of labour; given the empirical evidence and result to be obtained with its findings serving as a platform for further research and empirical studies. The findings of the study shall further refute or lend credence to existing bodies of knowledge on the subject matter and thus facilitate further research as regards the relationship between the study variables

**Practically:** The study will be of great benefit to various stakeholders and top leadership cadre of the selected paramilitary arms and other government institutions, employers of labour, general public as this will help broaden their horizon about the employee-leader relationship and duties, and help them effect better ways of dealing with it through establishment of effective policy and laws. Employers also will find the results useful in their management of various interpersonal relational events which might otherwise be discarded as mild without due cognizance of its repercussions and after-effects.

### Research Hypotheses

Based on the operational framework the following hypotheses were developed to identify the impact of leadership behaviour on employee job satisfaction.

**HO<sub>1</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and employee intrinsic job satisfaction.

**HO<sub>2</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and employee extrinsic job satisfaction.

**HO<sub>3</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between transactional leadership behaviour and employee intrinsic job satisfaction.

**HO<sub>4</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between transactional leadership behaviour and employee extrinsic job satisfaction.

**HO<sub>5</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between laissez faire leadership behaviour and employee intrinsic job satisfaction.

**HO<sub>6</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between laissez faire leadership behaviour and employee extrinsic job satisfaction.

**HO<sub>7</sub>:** The productivity of the employee does not significantly moderate the relationship between leadership behaviour and employee job satisfaction.

### **III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **Leadership**

Though leadership has long been of interest to historians and philosophers, giving one specific definition of leadership is a very complex task (Bass 1985). Leadership was also quoted by various researchers as “the major elements in order to preserve and improve an organization competitive advantage among its competitors” (Zhu et al., 2005; Rowe, 2001; Riaz and Haider, 2010).

Jolson et al. (1993) described leadership as the capability to influence the performance of followers. Thus a leader must deal directly with people, develop rapport with them, persuade and inspire them to collaborate in the achievement of goals and vision. Leaders need to show courage, integrity, compassion, vision, contribution and ethical stance. Furthermore, they should be able to judge how people feel, what motivates them, and how to influence them in the achievement of organizational objectives. Daft (2005) defined leadership as an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes outcomes thus reflecting shared purposes.

#### **Leadership Behaviour**

Mosadeghrad (2003) views leadership behaviour as a series of attitudes, characteristics and skills used by a manager in different situations in accordance with individual and organizational values. Managers use different behaviours in different situations with different subordinates to motivate them to perform at their utmost potential. Several studies have been conducted to examine the impact of leadership behaviours on organizational outcomes (Kreitner, 2008).

#### **Employee Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction has been defined by different authors in different ways. Job satisfaction reflects the extent to which an individual likes the job, and the organizations with satisfied employees are more productive than those with unsatisfied employees (Hellriegel and Slocum, 2007). Job satisfaction is influenced by many factors such as: the working conditions, work itself, supervision, policy and administration, advancement, compensation, interpersonal relationship, recognition and empowerment (Castillo and Cano 2004).

According to Quick (1998) each person has a different set of goals and can be motivated if he/she believes that: there is a positive correlation between efforts and performance; effective performance will result in a pleasing reward; the reward will satisfy an important need; and the desire to satisfy the need is strong enough to make the effort meaningful”. The researcher of this

study views job satisfaction as the fulfilling feeling an employee has in carrying out his/her job; of course, with this feeling the productivity level of the employee will be high.

Vroom (1964) suggested that the motivation to work depends on the relationships between expectancy, instrumentality and valence. Expectancy is a person's belief that working hard will result in a satisfying level of job performance. Instrumentality is an employee's belief that successful performance will be followed by rewards. And valence is the value a person holds with respect to outcomes (rewards). Job satisfaction has been treated both as a general attitude and satisfaction with five specific dimensions of the job. It includes employee feelings about various aspects of job such as pay, promotion opportunities, work conditions, supervision, organizational practices and relationships with co-workers (Misener et al. 1996). Job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that workers have towards their work.

Job satisfaction can be considered as one of the main factors when it comes to efficiency and effectiveness of business organizations. In fact, the new managerial paradigm which insists that employees should be treated and considered primarily as human beings that have their own wants, needs, personal desires is a very good indicator for the importance of job satisfaction in contemporary companies. When analyzing job satisfaction, the logic is that a satisfied employee is a happy employee and a happy employee is a successful employee.

### **Relationship between Leadership Behaviours and Employee Job Satisfaction**

Leadership behaviour is an important determinant of employee job satisfaction. The reactions of employees to their leaders will usually depend on the characteristics of the leaders (Wexley and Yukl 1984). Employee job satisfaction is influenced by the internal organization environment, which includes organizational climate, leadership types and personnel relationships (Seashore and Taber 1975).

The quality of the leader-employee relationship – or the lack thereof – has a great influence on the employee's self-esteem and job satisfaction (Chen and Spector 1991; Brockner 1988; DeCremer 2003). Employees are more satisfied with leaders who are considerate or supportive than with those who are either indifferent or critical towards subordinates (Yukl 1971).

As Wilkinson & Wagner (1993) argued, it is stressful for employees to work with a leader who has a hostile behaviour and is unsupportive. If subordinates are not capable of figuring out how to perform the work by themselves they will prefer a leader who will provide adequate guidance and instructions (Wexley and Yukl 1984). Negative leader-employee relations reduce productivity and increase absenteeism and the turnover to the organization can be quite high (Keashly, Trott, and MacLean 1994; Ribelin 2003).

According to Robbins (2003), "the employee resign rate with transformation leadership is less than with transactional leadership". Improving the employees' working situations, fulfilling their needs, and helping them perform better are positively related to transformational leadership (Liu et al. 2003). The review of the related literature reveals that transformational leadership behaviour influences employees' job satisfaction. The researcher also express the same view, the staff of the Federal Road Safety Corps and Nigerian Immigration Service as a Paramilitary Organization gets enthused, motivated to carry out their duties when the Commanding Officer is

one that inspires them, feels their pains i.e. compassionate, encourages them to do their best; not one that bully and call them derogatory names.

The Officers and Men are also on top of their duties when pay comes, when they are promoted as at when due and when their supervisor is a kind-hearted fellow (extrinsic dimensions). The level of production increases when Officers and Men have attained some level of achievement, recognition, responsibility, and advancement etc. (intrinsic dimensions).

### **The Moderating Effect of Employee Productivity**

Employee productivity can be defined as the capacity of employees to effectively produce desirable outcomes and at expected quantities or qualities within specified timelines (Borman and Motowidlo, 2001). Studies reveal that effective leadership and managerial style is strongly linked to instances of employee productivity and effectiveness results in higher levels of in-role effectiveness by positively affecting employees' motivation and contribution to the job (Brown, 1996; Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991). Leadership features and presence in the official tasks directly or indirectly influences the employee productivity levels, while the effort involved in such can be viewed as an intervening element between the association of employee job involvement and employee performance (Lassak, 2001); similarly, Brown and Leigh (1996) opined that there is a significant relationship between antecedents such as employee-supervisor relationship, job specifications, compensation, work conditions and aspects of employee productivity (Lassak, 2001); however, a weak connection can exist between job involvement and employee productivity due to some other variables (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991).

Employees who express contentment and satisfaction with their role expectations usually have high level of job involvement and there is a very constructive relationship between job involvement and employee productivity (Lassak, 2001; Yukl, 2006;). Leaders are in a position to impact an immense level of pressure and effect aimed at improving or enhancing workers or employee productivity and as such employees are constantly affected by outcomes of superior-subordinate relationships. Furthermore, leaders constantly place emphasis on concepts such as skill, talent and competency on their employees by choosing variables and attributes to be observed, insisting on major features of productivity and performance in cluster and personal assessments and by managing the stream to employees (Bass and Bass, 2009). Therefore, influence and affect can be considered as a central subject inside leadership.

## **IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

A set of individuals having something in common in a geographical location can be seen as population. Sekaran (2003), posit that study objects similar in a way or more and forms description of a particular survey can be referred to as population, which brings about the definition of an accessible population as those elements in the group which the researcher can access in the work of the research (Kothari, 2004); hence, the target population is 200 personnel: 100 officers and men from Federal Road Safety Corps Edo Sector Command; 100 Officers and Men from Nigeria Immigration Service - Edo Sector Command.

Okwandu (2007) observed that a sample refers to a subset of the members of an identified population which is being studied; similarly, Ahiauzu (2010) argued that a sample comprises some members selected from the population.

Using Taro Yamen's formula

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

Where

n = sample size sought

e = level of significance

N = population size

$$n = \frac{200}{1 + 200(0.05)^2}$$

$$= \frac{200}{1 + 200(0.0025)}$$

$$= \frac{200}{1.5}$$

$$= 133$$

This means that 133 were studied out of the 200 population.

**Validity Test:** The validity test will be ascertained by my Professors and other experts in the field.

### **Reliability**

Cronbach Alpha is a tool used to test for reliability, which according to Bryman & Bell (2003), alpha coefficient of .80 is accepted, Sekaran (2003), also posit .70 which is also considered for internal reliability of the instrument.

Based on the nature of the data distribution all tests are carried out using the spearman's rank order correlational tool.



**Table 1** Showing the Matric Correlation and Test for Hypotheses one (HO<sub>1</sub>) to two (HO<sub>2</sub>)

|                |           |                         | Transform | Intrinsic | Extrinsic |
|----------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Spearman's rho | Transform | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000     | .894**    | .722**    |
|                |           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .         | .000      | .000      |
|                |           | N                       | 113       | 113       | 113       |
|                | Intrinsic | Correlation Coefficient | .894**    | 1.000     | .599**    |
|                |           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000      | .         | .000      |
|                |           | N                       | 113       | 113       | 113       |
|                | Extrinsic | Correlation Coefficient | .722**    | .599**    | 1.000     |
|                |           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000      | .000      | .         |
|                |           | N                       | 113       | 113       | 113       |

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

Source: Data Output

**Table 1 illustrates the relationship between transformational leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction:** The data shows that there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership behaviours and intrinsic job satisfaction (where rho = .894 and P = 0.000); transformational leadership behaviours and extrinsic job satisfaction (where rho = .722 and P = 0.000). Therefore, based on the results we reject the null hypotheses one (HO<sub>1</sub>) and two (HO<sub>2</sub>): and restate that there is a significant relationship between:

- (1) Transformational leadership behaviours and intrinsic job satisfaction.
- (2) Transformational leadership behaviours and extrinsic job satisfaction.

**Table 2** Showing the Matric Correlation and Test for Hypotheses three (HO<sub>3</sub>) to four (HO<sub>4</sub>)

|                |               |                         | Transactional | Intrinsic | Extrinsic |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| Spearman's rho | Transactional | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000         | .574**    | .867**    |
|                |               | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .             | .000      | .000      |
|                |               | N                       | 113           | 113       | 113       |
|                | Intrinsic     | Correlation Coefficient | .574**        | 1.000     | .599**    |
|                |               | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000          | .         | .000      |
|                |               | N                       | 113           | 113       | 113       |
|                | Extrinsic     | Correlation Coefficient | .867**        | .599**    | 1.000     |
|                |               | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000          | .000      | .         |
|                |               | N                       | 113           | 113       | 113       |

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

Source: Data output

**Table 2 illustrates the relationship between transactional leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction:** The data shows that there is a significant relationship between transactional leadership behaviours and intrinsic job satisfaction (where rho = .574 and P = 0.000); transactional leadership behaviours and extrinsic job satisfaction (where rho = .867 and P = 0.000). Therefore, based on the results we reject the null hypotheses three (HO<sub>3</sub>) and four (HO<sub>4</sub>): and restate that there is a significant relationship between:

- (1) Transactional leadership behaviours and intrinsic job satisfaction.
- (2) Transactional leadership behaviours and extrinsic job satisfaction.

**Table 3** Showing the Matric Correlation and Test for Hypotheses five (HO<sub>5</sub>) to six (HO<sub>6</sub>)

|                |           |                         | Laiss  | Intrinsic | Extrinsic |
|----------------|-----------|-------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Spearman's rho | Laiss     | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000  | .732**    | .689**    |
|                |           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .      | .000      | .000      |
|                |           | N                       | 113    | 113       | 113       |
|                | Intrinsic | Correlation Coefficient | .732** | 1.000     | .599**    |
|                |           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000   | .         | .000      |
|                |           | N                       | 113    | 113       | 113       |
|                | Extrinsic | Correlation Coefficient | .689** | .599**    | 1.000     |
|                |           | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000   | .000      | .         |
|                |           | N                       | 113    | 113       | 113       |

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

Source: Data output

**Table 3 illustrates the relationship between Laissez faire leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction:** The data shows that there is a significant relationship between laissez faire leadership behaviours and intrinsic job satisfaction (where rho = .732 and P = 0.000); laissez faire leadership behaviours and extrinsic job satisfaction (where rho = .689 and P = 0.000). Therefore, based on the results we reject the null hypotheses five (HO<sub>5</sub>) and six (HO<sub>6</sub>): and restate that there is a significant relationship between:

- (1) Laissez faire leadership behaviours and intrinsic job satisfaction
- (2) Laissez faire leadership behaviours and extrinsic job satisfaction.

**Table 4** illustrating the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable

|              |                 | Leadership | Satisfaction |
|--------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| Leadership   | Correlation     | 1          | .964         |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed) |            | .000         |
|              | N               | 113        | 113          |
| Satisfaction | Correlation     | .964       | 1            |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000       |              |
|              | N               | 113        | 113          |

Source: Data Output

The Table 3.4 above illustrates the relationship between leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction (where Correlation = 0.964; P = 0.000).

**Table 5** illustrating the control for the moderating effect of employee productivity

| Control Variables |              |                         | Leadership | Satisfaction |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Productivity      | Leadership   | Correlation             | 1.000      | .567         |
|                   |              | Significance (2-tailed) | .          | .000         |
|                   |              | df                      | 0          | 110          |
|                   | Satisfaction | Correlation             | .567       | 1.000        |
|                   |              | Significance (2-tailed) | .000       | .            |
|                   |              | df                      | 110        | 0            |

Source: Data Output

**Table 5 illustrates the moderating effect of employee productivity on the relationship between leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction:** The data shows that employee productivity significantly moderates the relationship between leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction (where  $R_{.964} > R_{.567}$  and  $P = 0.000$ ); Therefore, based on the results we reject the null hypothesis five ( $H_{O7}$ ) and restate that employee productivity significantly moderates the relationship between leadership behaviours and employee job satisfaction.

## V. CONCLUSION

The results show a significant relationship between employee job satisfaction and leadership behaviours from findings of the study. The following conclusions were drawn:

- In achieving a greener environment and workforce, leaders' perception shown in their behaviours should be properly managed.
- Employees' perception to work, development and growth should be supported by their firms as to a very satisfied employee.
- A workplace that allows employees to interact and improve their skills.

When leader impressions and expressions is planned for, controlled and managed within the firm, it tend to improve the intrinsic, extrinsic job satisfaction of employees leading to long lasting growth and development in the organization.

## Recommendations

The researcher made the following recommendations as regards the study:

- Organizations should not always accept leader behavioural expressions as well as the harmonization of individual and organizational goals and objectives. Deliberate effort should be made to ensure there exists good understanding between top management and the subordinates.
- Organizations should make employees be aware of others' needs, team-work and personality traits by putting in place programs and policies.

- iii. Organizations should institute policies which control resources, behaviour at the workplace in ensuring that firms' goals are achieved timely.
- iv. At the organizational and individual level, behaviours should be understood and focused towards growth.
- v. Organizations should always use leadership characteristics and impressions to influence and achieve the satisfaction of the employees.

Satisfaction of employees has always been measured by their work-life; therefore, managers are urged to develop unity through diversity as this will create new ideas.

### REFERENCES

- Adebule, S. O. (2004). Gender differences on a locally standardized anxiety rating scale in mathematics for Nigerian secondary schools in Nigerian Journal of Counseling and Applied Psychology. Vol.1, 22-29 [2]
- Ahiauzu, A. I (2010), Advanced Research Methods in Management Sciences- lecture notes for PhD students, Rivers state university of science and technology, Port-Harcourt
- Aremu, A.O. & Oluwole, D.A. (2001). Gender and birth order as predictors of normal pupil's anxiety pattern in examination. Ibadan Journal of Educational Studies, 1, (1), 1-7.
- Aremu, O. A & Sokan, B. O. (2003). A multi-causal evaluation of academic performance of Nigerian learners: issues and implications for national development. Department of Guidance and Counselling, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Avolio, B. J. Waldman, D. A and Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990's: Journal of European industrial training.
- Avolio, B.J. and Bass, B.M. (2004), Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set, 3rd Ed., Mind Garden, Redwood City, CA.
- Baridam, D. M. (2001) *Research Methods in Administrative Sciences* 3<sup>rd</sup> edition Port Harcourt: Sherbrook Associates
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1990). The Implications of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Individual, team and Organizational development. Research in Organizational Change and Development. Vol. 4 No. 1, p. 231.
- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Bass, Bernard. M. and Ruth Bass. 2009. The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Application. 4th ed. New York. Free Press.

- Bennis W. and Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper Row.
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 52-69.
- Brockner J. (1988). *Self Esteem at Work*. Lexington, MA:D. C. Health and Company
- Bryman, A & Bell E. (2003): *Business Research Methods*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Castillo, and Cano (2004). Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction among Faculty.*Journal of Agricultural Education*, Vol. 45, No.3 p.65-74.
- Chen, P. Y. and Spector, P. E. (1991).Negatively affectivity as the underlying cause of correlations between stressors and strains.*Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, p.398-407.
- Christen, Lyer and Soberman (2006). Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, and Effort: *Journal of Marketing*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (2nd Ed.). London, Sage Publications
- Daft L., (2005) *The Leadership Experience*, 3rd Edition.
- Dana S.D (2001) *Statistics and Data Analysis for BehaviouralSciences*.Mcgraw- Hill, Higher Education, New-York.
- DeCremer, D. (2003). Why inconsistent leadership is regarded as procedurally unfair: The importance of social self-esteem concerns. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 33, No. 4, p.535-550
- Don M. Baridam (2008). *Research Methods in Administrative Sciences* 3<sup>rd</sup> edition p. 89-93.
- Gharoieahangar R. and Alijanirooshan, A. (2004).Building Managers as Transformational Leaders in Public Sector Banks.*Journal of Islamic Azad University*.
- Hellriegel.D and Slocum. J. W. (2007). *Organizational Behaviour* (11<sup>th</sup>ed). Thomson South-Western.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. and Johnson, D.E. (2001), *Management of Organizational Behaviour*, 8th ed., Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Herzberg H. F. (1976). *Motivation-Hygiene Profile*, p.20.
- House, R. J (1971).A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, September, 321-338.

- Keashly, L., Trott, V. and MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive Behaviour in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, Vol. 9, No. 4, p.341-357.
- Kennerly S. M. (1989). Leadership Behaviour and Organizational Characteristics: Implications for Faculty Satisfaction p. 198-202.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 698 – 707.
- Kreitner R. (2008). *Organizational Behaviour* (6<sup>th</sup>ed.) New York McGraw-Hill.
- Kyko O.C. (2005). *Instrumentation: Know Yourself and Others*. New York: Longman
- Lassk, F., Marshall, G., Cravens, D., and Moncrief, W. (2001). Salesperson job involvement: a modern perspective and a new scale. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 21, 291-302.
- Lawler and Porter (1967). *The Effect of Performance on Job Satisfaction*, Industrial Relations
- Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. New York: MacMillan.
- Liu, A. M. M, Fellow, R. F and Fang Z. (2003). *The Power Paradigm of Project Leadership, Construction Management and Economics*.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction, *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*,
- Luthans, F. (2008). *Organizational Behaviour*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- McClelland, D. C. and Burnham, D. H. (1976). Power is the Great Motivator. *Harvard Business review*. Vol. 54.No.2, p.100-110.
- Misener, T. R, Haddock, K. S. Gleaton, J. U and Ajamieh, A. R. (1996). *Toward an International Measure of Job Satisfaction*. *Nursing Research*. 45, 87-91.
- Mitzberg , H. (1973). *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York:
- Mosadeghrad, A. M. (2003). The Role of Participative Management (suggestion system) in hospital effectiveness and efficiency. *Research in Medical Sciences*, 8(3), 85-89.
- Northouse , P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. (6<sup>th</sup>ed.) Sage Publications, Inc.
- Okwandu, G.A. (2007), *Research Methods in Business and Social Sciences*: Civincs Publisher, Owerri, Nigeria.
- Quick, T. L. (1998). *Expectancy Theory in Five Simple Steps*. *Training and Development Journal*, Vol. 52, No. 9, p.30-32.

Rand-McNally

- Reger, R.K. (2001). From the Special Issue Edition: Managing in the information age. *Journal of Management*, May, 27(3): 233-234.
- Ribelin, P.J. (2003). Retention reflects leadership style. *Nursing Management*, Vol. 34, No. 8 p. 18-20.
- Robbins S.P. (2003). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications*, 10<sup>th</sup> ed., Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, N. J. USA.
- Rue and Byaes (2003). *Management, Skills and Application*, 10<sup>th</sup> ed. McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York, p.259.
- Ruzzel, J.S., & Guderson, D. C. (2003). The Effects of leader impression management on group perceptions of cohesion, consensus and commitment. *Journal of Group Research*, 34 (2) 197 – 222.
- Seashore, S. E. and Taber, T. D. (1975). *Job Satisfaction and their Correlations*, American Behaviour and Scientists.
- Sekaran U. (2003): *Research methods for business*; fourth edition. John Wiley & sons, pp. 294
- Smith P, Kendall L, Hulin C, (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*, Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tichy , N. and Devanna. M. (1996). *The Transformational Leader*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Tordera. N. Gonzalez-Roma, V and Peiro, J.M (2008). The moderator effect of psychological climate on the relationship between leader-member exchange (LMX) quality and role overload. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, p. 17, 55-72
- Vecchio , R.P Justin. J.E and Pearce, CL (2008). The utility of transactional and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction within a path-goal theory framework. *Journal of Occupational Organizational Psychology*, p. 81, 71-82. Vol. 6, p. 414-440.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*, Wiley, New York, NY.
- Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 173–194.
- Wexley K. N. and Yukl, G. A. (1984). *Organizational Behaviour, People and Processes in Management*. Richard D. Irwin, Homewood, Illinois 60430.
- Wilkinson, A. D. and Wagner R. M. (1993). Supervisory Leadership Styles and State Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor Job Satisfaction and Productivity. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, Vol. 37, No. 1, p.15-24.



Yammarino , F. J. Spangler, W. D, and Bass, B. M. (1993). Transformational Leadership and Performance: A longitudinal investigation leadership quarterly.

Yukl G. A. (1971). Toward a Behaviourial Theory of Leadership, Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance.

Yukl, G.A. (2002). Leadership in Organisations ((5<sup>th</sup> Ed).Englewood Cliffs.Prentice Hall.