

LEADERSHIP TOWARDS ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY FOR SUSTAINABLE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Okpe P.U. *Phd*¹ & Igwebuike F.K².

Department of Educational Management
Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike

Abstract

The study investigated the influence of leadership style on organizational productivity for sustainable national development. Three research questions and three null hypotheses guided the study. Data were collected from 10 heads of departments and 269 lecturers from the department of educational management in federal and state universities in South-East, Nigeria who served as the population. The size of the population was manageable so there was no need for sampling. The instrument used for data collection was a structured questionnaire of 24 items. Using mean and standard deviation, the research questions were analyzed, while the hypotheses were tested using chi-square statistics at 0.05 level of significance. The findings revealed among others that leadership style significantly influenced the quality of school turnout for sustainable national development and that democratic leadership style significantly influenced service delivery by the lecturers with regards to carrying out delegated duties, taking part in decision making and instructional management. It was thus recommended that leaders should be more democratic and dynamic in their leadership styles for increased productivity and qualitative output towards sustainable national development.

Introduction

Leadership is very important as it helps to guide, direct and stimulate growth with the aim of improving teaching and learning in the school. It is generally accepted that the style of leadership in an organization be it religious, social, business, military or otherwise affects to a large extent the success or failure of that organization. It is in view of this that Obi (2014) asserted that leadership style affects the functioning of an organization whether formal or an informal organization. He further stressed that a leader's approach can have an influence on the productivity of his /her staff and the rest of the organization. Men in leadership positions have onerous responsibility of achieving the goals of their organizations. Managers who set clear goals with employees maximize employees' productivity. Explaining further Ogbonnaya (2014) said that organizational efficiency is dependent on

each department, led by its head/manager, performing its job and contributing to the success of the organization. Thus, the way a leader makes decision, delegates duties, and interacts with the subordinates makes for success or failure of such organization. Numerous studies have described leadership styles with different terms such as democratic, autocratic, paternalistic, transactional and transformational. However, this study will be limited to examining the influence democratic and autocratic leadership styles have on productivity which are the two broad classifications of leadership styles described by (mgbodile, 2004).

It is the view of kenneth (2013) that democratic leaders could affect communication and service delivery in an organization. To him democratic leaders are open to employee involvement and allow employee to be part of the company's success. He observed that autocratic leaders tend to slow down communication by checking to make sure that every part of the message and delivery method follows strict leader's guidelines. This can hamper communication and prevent employees from getting instruction and information they need to do their jobs. Leaders who do not solicit for input from others can distort information to suit their own needs. Kouzes and Posner (2002) identified five practices that provide a model which all exemplary leaders including heads of departments should demonstrate. These models focus on the practice of challenging the status quo, seeking innovation, inspiring others, enabling others to act and encouraging the heart. Thus, the way in which a leader communicates, delegates duties, makes decision and motivates the employees could influence the quality of organizational productivity for sustainable development.

Productivity is seen as the measure of how well resources are brought together into organization and utilized for accomplishing a set of results (Mali, 2008). Productivity according to him, is reaching the highest level of performance with the least expenditure of resources. Nwachukwu (2014) defined productivity as the effectiveness of the use of factors of production (funds, physical facilities and equipment, personnel and motivation) to produce goods and services. It has been noted from this definition that the effectiveness of the use of personnel by leaders in an organization contributes largely to qualitative production for sustainable national development.

Sustainable development implies that one has the necessary skills, knowledge and attitude to meet one's present needs, ensure that his environment is protected and secured to meet the needs of future generation (Ememen, 2014). Sustainable development requires attitudinal change on the people, acceptance and motivation for shared responsibilities and adoption to new technologies. It also requires reorientation which can only be

accomplished through human capital development. It is the view of Jegede (2000) that democratic leaders could contribute maximally to sustainable national development. It has been reported by NCE (2012), Ilo (2010) and Cart (2008), that leadership styles have remarkable influence on organizational productivity. In view of the above situation, it has been noted by Linjuan (2014) that leadership style used by management can affect the effectiveness of the employee input. However, it appears that most school leaders and other stakeholders do not appreciate the fact that leadership styles play effective role in organizational productivity.

Economic well-being is created in a production process, meaning all economic activities that aim directly or indirectly to satisfy human needs. The degree to which the needs are satisfied is often accepted as a measure of economic well-being. In production there are two features which explain increasing economic well-being. They are improving quality-price-ratio of commodities and increasing service delivery in service organizations like school. School leaders are the pivot on which the success or failure of any school administration revolves. They are in charge of administrative duties such as decision making, delegation of duties, and instructional management among others. A critical examination of university education in Nigeria reveals that the system is beset with numerous problems. The trend of unemployment among university graduates is a source of worry to parents, students and the general public. The problem of this study put in a question form is: What would be the influence of leadership style on qualitative education for sustainable national development?

Three research questions and three hypotheses guided the study and they include:

1. What is the influence of leadership style on delegation of duties in an organization?
2. What is the influence of leadership style on decision making in an organization?
3. What is the influence of leadership style on instructional management in an organization?
4. There is no significant influence of Leadership style on delegation of duties in an organization.
5. There is no significant influence of leadership style on decision making in an organization.
6. There is no significant influence of leadership style on instructional management in an organization.

Method

The study adopted descriptive survey research design, and was carried out in the federal and state universities in South-East Nigeria which comprises of five states, namely: Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo states. The choice of this area was based on the fact that universities in the area are faced with numerous problems on qualitative education for sustainable national development and thus would value a study on the leadership styles towards sustainable national development. The population of the study comprised 279 respondents which include 269 lecturers and 10 heads of departments in the study area. There was no sampling because of the manageable size of the population. A structured questionnaire of 4 point likert type on leadership styles towards sustainable national development in Nigerian Universities was developed and used for the study. And the reliability coefficient of the clusters all together was 0.91.

The data collected from the respondents were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and chi-square statistics. The mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions. Any item with a mean rating of 2.50 and above was regarded as agreed while any item with a mean rating less than 2.50 was regarded as disagreed. The correlated chi-square statistic was used to test the three null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. Any hypothesis whose significance level was less than or equal to 0.05 level of significance, was rejected, while a hypothesis with significance level greater than 0.05 level was not rejected. The analysis was done using SPSS.

Result

Table 1: mean and standard deviations of respondents’ opinion on the influence of leadership styles on delegation of duties

| S/N | ITEMS | LEADERSHIP STYLES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------|----|-----|----|------|------|------------|-----|---|----|-----|------|------|----------|
| | | DEMOCRATIC | | | | | | AUTOCRATIC | | | | | | | |
| | | SA | A | D | SD | X | SD | Remark | SA | A | D | SD | X | SD | Remark |
| 1 | Head of department delegate duties to staff | 252 | 27 | - | - | 3.75 | 0.42 | Agree | - | - | 9 | 270 | 1.06 | 1.48 | Disagree |
| 2 | Gives staff freedom to perform delegated duties | 262 | 17 | - | - | 3.91 | 0.22 | Agree | - | - | 19 | 260 | 1.07 | 1.26 | Disagree |
| 3 | Strickly supervise delegated duties | - | - | 266 | 13 | 1.95 | 0.21 | Disagree | 271 | 8 | - | - | 3.85 | 0.51 | Agree |
| 4 | Transfer authority to staff on delegated duties | 209 | 70 | - | - | 3.74 | 0.32 | Agree | - | - | 09 | 270 | 1.06 | 1.35 | Disagree |
| 5 | Encourage staff innovation | 216 | 63 | - | - | 3.81 | 0.20 | Agree | - | - | 12 | 267 | 1.08 | 1.21 | Disagre |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----|----|----|-----|------|------|----------|-----|----|----|-----|------|------|----------|
| 6 | Have confidence on staff performing delegated duties | 269 | 10 | - | - | 3.96 | 0.20 | Agree | - | - | 09 | 270 | 1.06 | 1.35 | Disagree |
| 7 | Find it hard to delegate duties | - | - | 29 | 250 | 1.12 | 0.39 | Disagree | 252 | 27 | - | - | 3.75 | 0.42 | Agree |
| 8 | Reward staff for work well done | 273 | 06 | - | - | 3.97 | 0.28 | Agree | - | - | 71 | 208 | 1.25 | 1.20 | Disagree |

The result of the data analysis in table 1, indicate that in items 1, 2,4,5,6 and 8 the responses of the respondents relating to influence of leadership style on delegation of duties in state and federal universities in South-East Nigeria had mean scores ranging from 3.74 – 3.97 under democratic leadership style that are above the cutoff point of 2.50 with the exception of items 3 and 7 which are negative items. The result shows that democratic leaders influence workers positively through delegation of duties when compared with autocratic leaders with mean scores ranging from 1.06 to 1.25 in all the items except items 3 and 7 which are negative items. The standard deviation values under democratic leaders and autocratic leaders respectively ranged from 0.20 to 0.42 and 1.06 to 1.25 which showed that the respondents were not too far from the mean.

Table 2: Influence of Leadership style on decision making

| S/N | ITEMS | LEADERSHIP STYLES | | | | | | | | AUTOCRATIC | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------|----|---|----|------|------|-------|----|------------|----|------|------|------|----------|--|--|
| | | SA | A | D | SD | X | SD | Rmk | SA | A | D | SD | X | SD | Rmk | | |
| 9 | Involve staff on decision making on issues that concern them | 262 | 17 | - | - | 3.94 | 0.24 | Agree | - | - | 14 | 265, | 1.05 | 0.22 | Disagree | | |
| 10 | Sets departmental goal with staff | 260 | 19 | - | - | 3.90 | 0.31 | Agree | - | - | 12 | 267 | 1.04 | 1.21 | Disagree | | |
| 11 | Does not Force his/her ideas on staff | 267 | 12 | - | - | 3.94 | 0.42 | Agree | - | - | 26 | 253 | 1.08 | 1.31 | Disagree | | |
| 12 | Staff participate in development of new programmes | 265 | 14 | - | - | 3.93 | 0.22 | Agree | - | - | 26 | 253 | 1.11 | 1.36 | Disagree | | |
| 13 | Welcomes staff positive contributions | 266 | 13 | - | - | 3.92 | 0.21 | Agree | - | - | 06 | 273 | 1.04 | 1.41 | Disagree | | |
| 14 | Sets specific employee goals with the staff | 268 | 11 | - | - | 3.95 | 0.31 | Agree | - | - | 14 | 265 | 1.09 | 1.48 | Disagree | | |
| 15 | welcomes staff initiatives | 266 | 13 | - | - | 3.92 | 0.21 | Agree | - | - | 14 | 265 | 1.68 | 1.48 | Disagree | | |
| 16 | Sets clear goals with staff | 267 | 12 | - | - | 3.94 | 0.42 | Agree | - | - | 12 | 267 | 1.08 | 1.21 | Disagree | | |

Data presented in table 2 showed that the mean ratings of the responses of the respondents on the 8 identified items relating to decision making in an organization had mean values that are above the cut-off point of 2.50 under

democratic leaders. The data in the table indicated that democratic leaders involve subordinates in decision making more than autocratic leaders with mean scores ranging from 1.04 to 1.68 that are all below the cut-off point of 2.50 for autocratic leaders. The standard deviation values under democratic and autocratic leaders ranged from 0.21 to 0.42 and 1.21 to 1.45 respectively which showed that the respondents were not too far from the mean.

Table3: Influence of leadership style on instructional management.

| S/N | ITEMS | LEADERSHIP STYLES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------|----|---|----|------|------|------------|----|---|----|-----|------|------|----------|
| | | DEMOCRATIC | | | | | | AUTOCRATIC | | | | | | | |
| | | SA | A | D | SD | X | SD | Remark | SA | A | D | SD | X | SD | Remark |
| 17 | Ensures that lecturers cover the course content | 260 | 19 | - | - | 3.91 | 0.22 | Agree | - | - | 27 | 252 | 1.11 | 1.47 | Disagree |
| 18 | Lecturers are motivated to put in their best | 209 | 70 | - | - | 3.74 | 0.32 | Agree | - | - | 17 | 260 | 1.10 | 1.28 | Disagree |
| 19 | Assignments are given to students | 268 | 11 | - | - | 3.80 | 0.27 | Agree | - | - | 14 | 265 | 1.09 | 1.48 | Disagree |
| 20 | Students semester results are made ready at the end of the semester | 209 | 70 | - | - | 3.74 | 0.32 | Agree | - | - | 06 | 273 | 1.04 | 1.41 | Disagree |
| 21 | Lecturers cover their course content at the end of the semester | 268 | 11 | - | - | 3.80 | 0.29 | Agree | - | - | 12 | 267 | 1.08 | 1.21 | Disagree |
| 22 | Activities of the course coordinators are monitored | 253 | 26 | - | - | 3.76 | 0.28 | Agree | - | - | 14 | 265 | 1.09 | 1.20 | Disagree |
| 23 | Students' class attendance is monitored | 216 | 63 | - | - | 3.81 | 0.18 | Agree | - | - | 17 | 262 | 1.10 | 1.31 | Disagree |
| T24 | Students attend lectures regularly | 253 | 26 | - | - | 3.76 | 0.28 | Agree | - | - | 27 | 252 | 1.11 | 1.47 | Disagree |

Data in table 3 reveal a positive influence of democratic leadership style on instructional management when compared with autocratic leadership style. This is shown by the mean values of all the items that are above the cut-off point of 2.50 under democratic leadership. Autocratic leadership style had marks below the cut-off point of 2.50 in all the items. The standard deviation values under democratic leadership and autocratic leadership styles ranged from 0.21 to 0.42 and 1.21 to 1.45 respectively which showed that the respondents were not too far from the mean.

Table 4: X² Analysis of influence of leadership style on delegation of duties.

| variables | N | Df | X | SD |
|------------|-----|----|------|------|
| Democratic | 279 | 3 | 3.75 | 0.32 |
| Autocratic | | 3 | 2.2 | 0.21 |
| Total | | | 5.77 | 0.53 |

$$\chi^2_{\text{Cal}}=86.8, \chi^2_{\text{Crit/tab}}=7.815, df=3, p \leq 0.05$$

Table 4 clearly shows that X² calculated value of 86.8 is greater than X² critical/table value of 7.815. The null hypothesis of no significant influence of leadership style on delegation of duties was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. This therefore, means that there is significant influence of the leadership styles of democratic and autocratic leaders on delegation of duties.

Table 5: X² analysis of influence of leadership style on decision making in an organization

| variables | N | Df | X | SD |
|------------|-----|----|------|------|
| Democratic | 279 | 3 | 3.89 | 0.38 |
| Autocratic | | 3 | 1.89 | 0.26 |
| Total | | | 5.78 | 0.64 |

$$\chi^2_{\text{cal}}=33.0, \chi^2_{\text{crit/tab}}=7.815, df=3, p \leq 0.05$$

Data in table 5 shows that X² calculated value of 33.0 is greater than X² critical/table value of 7.815. The null hypothesis of no significant influence was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. This therefore, means that there is significant influence of leadership styles of democratic and autocratic leaders on decision making.

Table 6: X² analysis of influence of leadership style on instructional management in an organization

| variables | N | Df | X | SD |
|------------|-----|----|------|------|
| Democratic | 279 | 3 | 3.60 | 0.21 |
| Autocratic | | 3 | 1.76 | 0.15 |
| Total | | | 4.36 | 0.36 |

$$\chi^2_{\text{cal}}=25.3, \chi^2_{\text{crit/tab}}=7.815, df=3, p \leq 0.05$$

Data in table 6 shows that X^2 calculated value of 25.3 is greater than X^2 critical/table value of 7.815. The null hypothesis of no significant influence was rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. This therefore, means that there is significant influence of leadership styles of democratic and autocratic leaders on decision making.

Discussion

The result of the findings with respect to research question 1 as indicated in table 1 recorded a high positive mean response to democratic leadership style with mean values greater than 2.50 in all the items except in items 3 and 7 which are negative items. This indicated that democratic heads of departments delegate duties to staff; give staff freedom to perform delegated duties; transfers authority to staff on delegated duties; encourage staff innovation; have confidence on staff performing delegated duties and reward staff for work well done. In the same vein, the result of the hypothesis 1 (Ho1) showed that leadership style significantly influenced delegated duties in an organization. This is shown by the calculated X^2 calculated value of 86.8 which is greater than the X^2 critical/table value of 7.815. The null hypothesis of no significant influence of leadership style on delegation of duties in an organization was therefore rejected. This finding is in line with that of Kenneth (2013) who said that democratic leaders are open to employee involvement and allow employee to feel part of the company's success

Data analyzed in table 2 revealed that democratic leaders had mean values that are higher than 2.50. in all the items. This indicated that democratic leaders involve lecturers in decision making more than autocratic leaders. The level of involvement in decision making increases communication flow and commitment to duty which invariably increases productivity. In the same vein the result of the hypothesis 2 in table 5 also indicated significant influence of leadership style on decision making in an organization. This is shown by the X^2 calculated value of 33.0 that is greater than the X^2 critical/table value 7.815. This means that the null hypothesis of no significant influence of leadership styles on decision making was rejected. This finding is in line with Obi (2014) who opined that managers who set clear goals with employees maximize employee productivity.

The result in table 3 revealed that democratic leaders had a higher mean value are above the cut-off point of 2.50 in instructional management. This indicated that democratic leaders exhibited higher positive influence in instructional management than autocratic leaders with a lower mean scores below 2.50 in all the items. The result of hypothesis 3 in table 6 also revealed that the X^2 calculated value of 25.3 is greater than the X^2 critical/table value of

7.815. The null hypothesis 3 of no significant influence of leadership style on instructional management is therefore rejected. Democratic leadership style therefore increases productivity in an organization through efficient management of instruction. This finding is in line with Linjuan (2014) who noted that leadership style used by management can affect positively the effectiveness of the employee input through efficient instructional delivery.

Conclusion

From the results and discussion of the findings of the study, the researchers concluded that leadership style influences delegation of duties, decision making and management of instruction in an organization. Furthermore, leader's effectiveness in delegation of duties, decision making and management of instruction encourages qualitative organizational output which is a significant tool for sustainable national development.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made:

1. Leaders should always delegate duties to subordinates to enhance active involvement in organizational programmes.
2. Workers should be involved in taking decisions on issues concerning them. This is because a staff that feels recognized and has confidence in the organization's vision would be more productive.
3. Class room instruction should be adequately managed by school leaders for quality output.
4. Fund should be provided by the government and institutional heads for educational materials and equipment for qualitative output towards sustainable national development.

References

- Cart, M. (2008). Overview of leadership in organization. *www.org omics online. effect-of-leadership. style-on-employee performance.*
- Ememen, P.I. (2014) *Analyzing educational issues.* Essays in honour of emeritus professor Pai Obanya. Ibadan: Society for promotion of academic and research excellence(SPARE).
- Iloh, C. A. (2010) Principals' Leadership in Management of Educational Reform in Delta State Secondary Schools. *International journal of CUDIMAC 2(1) 78-87*
- Jegede, I. O. (2000). *Mass education a panacea for sustainable development.* New century Journal of education 1(1) 216-224

- Kenneth, L. (2013). How leadership influence learning. *www. How – leadership influences-student-learning pdf- Adobe Reader*. Retrieved 4th June, 2016.
- Kouzes, J. and Posne, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd .ed) San Francisco: John wily and sons, Inc.
- Linjuan. R. M. (2014). Measuring the impact of leadership style and employee empowerment on perceived organizational reputation. Retrieved from *www.what works.edu.org*.
- Mali. B.U. (2008). *Management of Personnel in Nigerian Universities*. Lagos: Malt House Press Limited
- NCE, (2012). National curriculum services. *www.what works.edu.org. sustainable school and community participation*. Retieved 4th June, 2016.
- Nwachukwu. A.C. (2014). *Dynamics of Administrative Leadership*. Lokoja: Ernest Printing Press
- Obi, E. (2014). *Issues in educational administration*. Enugu: Empathy International
- Ogbonnaya, (2014). Administrative competency needs of provost of colleges of education. *International journal of educational administration and planning* 4(1) 62-73