

EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON PRODUCTIVITY OF SECRETARIES IN THE NIGERIAN PUBLIC SECTOR.

Tijjani Mohammed SAJO
Faculty of Education, Federal University of Kashere,
KASHERE, Gombe State

ABSTRACT

Recently, there have been concerns about the attitude of some secretaries or administrative assistants in various organisations across Nigeria and this has been blamed on several factors. This paper subjects the types of leadership styles to productivity of secretaries or administrative assistants in the public sector in Nigeria. It has been found out that Leadership is not attached to a particular style but uses the style that may fit the situation or circumstance. Many secretaries and administrative assistants are aware of the competences needed to perform their role. However, these competences appear to be not in use or exhibited by this category of employees. Autocratic leadership style does not necessarily lead to high turnover and absenteeism, low productivity and distortion of communication.

KEYWORDS: Autocratic, Democratic, Leadership, Human Relations, Performance, Productivity,

INTRODUCTION

For centuries the corporate world has been obsessed with leaders, and with identification of the characteristics required for effective leadership. In more recent times the area of leadership has been studied more extensively than almost any other aspect of human behaviour (Higgs, 2003). Leadership has been defined severally by authors focusing on traits, behaviours, influence, interaction patterns, role relationship and as an occupation of an administrative position (Yukl, 2012). Kruse (2013) defines leadership as “a process of social influence, which maximizes the efforts of others towards the achievement of a goal”. Beyond this, scholars have given numerous definitions of leadership (House et al. 1997; Hemphil and Coons, 1957; Katz and Khan, 1978; Burns, 1978; Rauch and Behling, 1984; Richards and Engle, 1986; Jacobs and Jaques, 1990; Schein, 1992; Drath and Palus, 1994). According to Yukl (2012) and Kruse (2013), this definition is based on the assumption that leadership involves intentionally influencing people working in various capacities in a group or organisations. Again Yukl (2012) and Kruse (2013) posit that leadership take place only when people are influenced to do things that are ethical and beneficial to the organisation.

Secretaries are among the categories of workers that come under both direct and indirect influence of leaders (Yukl, 2012). A secretary, according to Mayer (1977) is an executive assistant who possesses a mastery of office skills, demonstrates the ability to assume responsibility with or without supervision, exercises initiatives and judgment, and makes decision with the scope of assigned authority. To Pringle

(1989) a secretary is supposed to facilitate communication between a section or department and the rest of the organization, clients, customers, and suppliers through the use of both written and verbal forms of communication. Cohn (1985), is also of the view that in addition to typing dictated letters, experienced secretaries provide information, compose routine statements, and make practical arrangement for solution of problems. France (2009) sums it all by saying that today's secretaries are expected to be multi task and multi skilled, have important problem solving skill and are the first to know what is going on in the organization. Kanter, (1977) and Cohn (1985) state that the scope of secretary's roles or responsibilities is company specific and person specific and could be dependent on the nature of relationship between the secretary and the line manager. Cohn (1985) argues that secretaries have to provide different responses to suit the different routines of their bosses. This supports the assertion made above that secretaries are influenced by their line managers and that the leadership styles adopted by the line managers may have an impact on their productivity.

This study is grounded on the dyadic leadership theory (Yukl 2010). This theory talks about the relationship between a leader and an individual and that the motivation and the capability of an individual to a goal is based on the influence of the leader (Yukl 2010). Yukl (2010), explains that the behavior of leader is the source of influence that changes a subordinate's behavior, attitudes and motivation. Although there are multiple dyadic relationships, this study focused on the single relationship which is between the leader and the individual subordinate (Yukl 2010).

The importance of leadership styles in an organization cannot be overemphasized. Leadership is a major element that sets successful and unsuccessful organizations and governments apart. It plays central role in offering direction and purpose towards achieving goals of the organization. The move of a substantial number of leadership researchers to studying new types of styles and other investigations of the leadership styles of men and women have opened opportunities for further research on the effect of managers' leadership styles on secretaries' productivity.

Research has revealed that there are different leadership styles such as Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez Faire which managers have adopted to enable them to offer proper guidance to subordinates towards the achievement of organizational goals and objectives (Warrick 1981). Though it is believed that these are applied separately depending on the prevailing circumstance(s) within business/Organizational setting, some managers adopt and misapply leadership styles that make the secretary's work more difficult in terms of liaising between the manager and clients or visitors.

Scholars have undertaken research on the relationship between leadership styles and organizational performance (Puni et al. 2014; Elenkov, 2002; García-Morales et al. 2008; Sethibe and Steyn 2016; Obiwuru et al. 2011) and leadership styles and

employee performance

(Eran Vigoda Gadot, 2007; Mitchel and Palmer 2010; Rizki et al. 2017; Hayward et al. 2004).

However, it appears that not much has been done on leadership styles and specific job roles. This paper seeks to examine the effects of leadership styles on the productivities of secretaries in Nigeria. The aim of this paper is to explore the functions of secretaries in organizations and to examine their competences with respect to leadership styles of their superiors.

Every business/organization is expected to communicate with its stakeholders. This will involve a concept called organisational communication (Jablin & Putnam, 2000). According to them, organisational communication involves a situation where a person is supposed to design and exchange messages in order to deal with environmental uncertainties. There is no doubt that at the centre of this is the work of a secretary. A secretary is an executive assistant who possesses a mastery of office skills and has the ability to take responsibility with no or less supervision, ability to make decision regarding the assigned duties, and being familiar with the work schedule of the boss as well as the boss's extracurricular activities (Azih 2013). For a secretary to be able to perform this important function really well may be dependent on the type of the leadership style of the superior. This is because leadership style plays a significant role in enhancing or retarding the interest and commitment of the individuals in the organization (Obiruwu et al. 2011). This review provides an overview of previous research on the types of leadership styles, the competencies of secretaries, the functions of secretaries, and how a choice of leadership style affects the secretary's productivity.

Types of leadership styles

Leadership style is a way in which leaders interact or behave towards members of their team (Gastil, 1994; Mullins, 1996). Various styles of leadership have been recognized by scholars, which include democratic, autocratic and laissez faire leadership styles. In addition to the above, researchers such as Burns, (1978) Bass & Avolio (1997), Eagly et al (2003) and many more, have come out with thorough investigations on the concept of transformational and transactional leadership styles.

Democratic Leadership : Democratic leadership is a behaviour that persuades people in a certain way in accordance with and/or favourable to basic democratic principles and processes, such as self determination, inclusiveness, equal participation, and deliberation (Harris and Chapman, 2004). However, Warrick (1981) defined democratic leadership as a leadership style that places high emphasis on people and performance to achieve organizational and personal goals.

It does this by striving for a well organized work environment and clear responsibilities and objectives to get jobs done through motivation and management of individuals and groups to use their full potentials (Warrick 1981).

This style of leadership, also referred to as enlightened leadership, recognizes individual's or person's self actualization and self esteem through a highly encouraging and motivation orientated environment. It puts into practice members' involvement in considering essential issues and exercises influence in reaching consensual decisions (Goodnight 2004). Evaluating the ideas of the above researchers, it is evident that the democratic style of leadership focuses on the individuals' and groups' participation and performance through motivational activities, and recognizes members' opinions and involvement in decision making.

Autocratic Leadership

Autocratic style of leadership as explained by Warrick (1981), places high emphasis on performance and low emphasis on people for getting jobs done or achieving objectives through the use of authority, control, manipulation, and hard work. It assumes that people are untrustworthy, lazy, and irresponsible, and that, members should not or have minimal involvement in decision making, planning, organizing, and control (Warrick 1981). Goodnight (2004) also suggested that autocratic leadership style is structured in hierarchical chain of command environment with well established and controlled disciplinary procedures, which focus on punishment for nonconformity. He further explained that the autocratic leader takes final decisions alone and imposes on the members, and believes that members have less abilities and capabilities and that, they need to be supervised and directed closely. DuBrin (1995) describes autocratic style of leadership as a style with which leaders retain most authority to themselves and solely make decisions with a view of ensuring that members implement it without taking into consideration their attitudes and opinions in decisions making. It could be deduced from these researchers that, the autocratic leadership style has minimal recognition for members' involvement in decision making and that, there is lack of trust for members. However, this style places higher emphasis on performance mostly through the use of command and force towards the achievement of the objectives.

Laissez faire Leadership

Goodnight (2004) has proposed that with the laissez faire style of leadership, there is a strong belief that members or employees know the best way to perform their jobs and that they do not need direct supervision. This means that there is a freedom of choice for employees to do what they want. According to him, provision of information and resources is minimal with this style of leadership, and there is absolutely no participation, involvement, or communication within workforce, and also, employees' agreements and commitments towards goals and objectives are

just assumed. In addition to Goodnight's opinion, Warrick (1981) suggested that, laissezfaire style of leadership places low emphasis on employees and performance with the assumption that human beings are unpredictable and uncontrollable. Therefore, a leader should do as much as possible to stay away from troubles and keep a low profile by leaving the people or giving the people the freedom to do whatever they want. Judge and Piccolo (2004) referred to laissez faire leadership style as “nonleadership”, because it is the avoidance of leadership. They illustrated that this type of leadership abdicates decision making and avoids taking action. The above authors described the laissez faire style of leadership in different ways but they have the same initiative about this style of leadership. This leadership style offers members or employees the freedom to perform their jobs and to make their own decisions, with no control or supervision on the employees.

Human Relations Leadership

Human relations leaders take into consideration the welfare and well being of the people instead of the performance of a task (Warrick, 1981). According to Warrick (1981), human relations leaders have good and harmonic relationship with followers and consider followers' participation in decision making because, they assume “all” people are honest, trustworthy, and self motivating, therefore, followers should be provided with a favourable working environment in order to make them happy which will consequently make them productive.

Transformational Leadership

According to Bass (1999), transformational leadership refers to a behaviour in which the leader promotes the members' level of maturity and concerns for accomplishments beyond instant self interest and self actualization through idealized persuasion, logical inspiration or individual consideration and the well being of others, the organization, and the society. From a different perspective, Bolden et al (2003), described transformational leadership as a "process" in which leaders try to develop their followers by increasing the awareness of their followers about what is essential and right, and to elevate the maturity level of their followers by developing their potentials to a level that exceeds a simple exchange of reward for efforts. Bolden et al (2003) idea corresponds with Bass's (1999) idea with exception that Bolden et al (2003) described transformational leadership style as a process. Apart from that, they viewed transformational leadership as a style that develops and prepares members or followers to become future leaders by means of inspiration, motivation, and persuasion to exceed the normal performance standards to a higher standard. Transformational leaders seek to increase the developmental level of members towards achievements and benefits for individuals, the organization, and the society. The effort of developing followers makes transformational leaders proactive and fast thinkers.

Transactional Leadership

From the perspective of Bass (1999), transactional leadership refers to the exchange connection that exists between the leader and the followers in meeting their own self interest. He buttressed his opinion by saying that, the transactional leader establishes a contingent reward in exchange of the efforts of the followers either through directing or by participating on what needs to be done by the followers. In connection to this behaviour as observed by Bass (1999) is management by exception. This is where performance of followers is supervised by leaders and corrective measures are taken for non performance. It could also be in the form of passive leadership where leaders wait until problems occur before corrective measures are taken, or leaders would rather prefer not to take any action as characterized by laissez faire leadership. However, Eagly et al (2003), based on a prior research on leadership style for men and women, confirmed transactional leadership as managing in such a way that clarifies subordinates' responsibilities and rewarding them for achievement of standards, as well as taking corrective actions for failure to meet objectives. In consideration of the perceptions of the above researchers, transactional leadership is viewed as a mutual agreement between the leader and the subordinates, in which the leader seeks to attain best performance from subordinates in exchange of a reward, while the leader establishes corrective actions for failure of performance.

Competencies of secretaries

According to Ezenwafor (2013), competency is the ability to complete a task, find and apply solution to problems effectively. On the other hand, Robinson and Davidson (1999), define competency as capability or efficiency in undertaking assigned functions and duties. Ezenwafor (2013) is of the view that competency has the following components knowledge and skills, (attitudes and beliefs), verbal, numerical and spatial aptitudes, thinking and leadership abilities, general, professional and organizational knowledge. Ezenwafor and Okeke (2011) identified the following competencies of secretaries needed for effective performance secretarial competencies, office technology management competencies, communication competencies, management competencies, personality competencies and human relation competencies.

Secretarial competencies –

According to Ezenwafor and Okeke (2011) secretarial competencies comprise of speed and accuracy in using the keyboard, ability to produce documents with effective display and format, ability to proofread and edit documents, file and promptly retrieve documents from the file, keep track of files, handle correspondence, draft routine letters, organize meetings and produce suitable minutes.

Office technology competencies –

Technology is said to refer to the collection of tools, machinery, modifications, environmental arrangement and procedures. This means that office technology would cover all electronic equipment and facilities that enhance the procedures used to process office information. Therefore, secretaries are expected to have competencies with respect to office technology – ability to connect hardware components, boot and shut down computer, effectively use input devices, connect and use printer and relevant equipment for duplication, use secondary storage devices, use the internet for data collection and e-mailing, prevent viral infection and use software such as word processor, spread sheet and data base management (Ezenwafor and Okeke 2011).

Communication competencies –

Ezenwafor and Okeke (2011) continued that communication is the process of transmitting information from one person or place to another. In business organisations, this is important to enable the organization achieve the stated objectives. However, communication needs to be effective by way of ensuring that the intended message is received, correctly interpreted and understood, accepted and appropriately acted upon by the receiver and confirmed by feedback. To make this happen, the secretaries need to have the following competencies – the ability to understand the official language, use oral communication effectively, effectively use written communication, spell words correctly in written communication, pronounce words correctly and clearly in oral communication, use suitable gestures to communicate, communicate with facial expressions, communicate orally with adequate tone and write legibly and logically in written communication.

Management competencies –

Obayi (2009), is of the view that a manager is supposed to possess special abilities to succeed. Hence management is needed in all human endeavours and by extension, all workers including secretaries in organizations need to practice good management to succeed. To undertake this function, secretaries need the following competencies – the ability to protect office documents from loss or willful destruction, properly handle and adequately maintain work equipment and facilities, manage the work environment by properly arranging and maintaining furniture and equipment, select suitable equipment and other devices for work, procure relevant office stationery and supplies, suitably use office hours, maintain confidentiality of office records, organize personal efforts and energy as well as those of subordinates and persistently seek solutions to problems.

Personality competencies –

Personality is explained to refer to all the physical, mental and emotional characteristics of an individual that are presented to other people. It is formed from childhood but goes through gradual changes through daily experiences. Happiness, job satisfaction and self-fulfillment of a worker are closely associated with

personality. Secretaries need the following competencies to enable them relate well with people at work – ability to always maintain good appearance, demonstrate team spirit, speak and deal truthfully at all times, maintain cheerfulness and be approachable, tolerate other people, innovate workable ideas and processes, use initiative, apply self control at all times, respect superiors and others, persistently work even when extra time is needed and be polite all the time.

Human relations competencies –

Human relations is the interaction that occur among people in an environment. From the point of view of Fulmar (1977), human relations involve dealing with people in such a way as to help achieve collective goals. It is about interaction at the workplace aimed at understanding fellow workers and clients to achieve organizational goal. Secretaries need human relations competencies to answer calls, treat mail and attend visitors, relate with the public, superiors, equals, subordinates and colleagues in general. These competencies are – ability to understand and treat other people as important members of the organization, be a member of a team, protect the interest of the supervisor, show respect to the supervisor at all times, get along with others, ability to be open and sociable, to be selfless, ability to listen and hear other people's point of view.

Functions/roles of secretaries

Ezenwafor (2013), identified the following as functions of secretaries in an organization.

Data generation or collection –

Data is a set of raw facts that need to be processed to make it meaningful and usable to individual or a group of individuals. Secretaries perform the function of generating or collecting data by flipping through pages of files or clicking some buttons or keys of ICT hardware components or clicking options in a software component. They may also source needed data from other institutions or organisations through the internet.

Data processing and interpretation –

Information is the outcome of data that has gone through processing. According to Ezenwafor (2013), processed data could only be an information when the data is properly analysed and interpreted to serve a useful purpose. Data analysis and interpretation do not always involve statistical tools as some times simple mathematical tools and common sense are sufficient. Secretaries undertake analysis and interpretation of data using statistical tools and simple mathematical tools.

Information and office management –

Ezenwafor (2013) is of the view that, management takes place at all levels of human activities at all times and places. The secretary's information management functions include creation of all types of documents, dissemination of the documents, storing, retrieval of stored documents and making changes in the existing documents when new information becomes available. According to Obayi (2009), filing plays a major role in the performance of this function. Filing is said to be aimed at collection of information for references and preservation. For effectiveness, filing should meet the following conditions – simplicity, security, compactness and comprehensiveness, clear cross referencing, space, economy, accessibility and adaptability (Obayi 2009).

Ezenwafor (2013) identified three types of information management systems characterized to three types of office. Information management that involves the use of papers, file jackets, file cabinets, and naming and numbering of files relate to traditional office. Information management involving the use of different hardware and software technological resources relate to an automated office while information management that partly use both traditional office style and automated office style is or transition office.

Treating correspondence –

Robinson and Davidson (1999) defined correspondence as letters received or sent out of an office. Secretaries perform the function of reproducing manuscripts that originate from their supervisors as out going mails from the office and receive and treat in coming mails according to a prescribed procedure. In performing this function, secretaries are supposed to be creative, innovative and discreet.

Organizing and clerking meetings –

Shaw and Smith (1979) explain that meeting is an assembly of persons for a particular purpose. According to Omotosho (1979) the purpose may include sharing of ideas, expressing of views on topics raising or offering suggestions or solutions to problems. Little (1977) summed it up by saying that meetings are major part of communications in an organization and that all secretaries are supposed to be familiar with the necessary procedure for a successful meeting. The procedures include preparing and serving notice and agenda, collecting and assembling relevant data and information to facilitate discussions or solution of problems at meetings, clerking meetings, producing the minutes and distributing them to all the people entitled to have copies.

Handling telecommunication and postal services –

There are many services offered by telecommunication and postal services companies. Secretaries are supposed to be familiar with these services and their charges to enable them perform related functions promptly and efficiently.

Leadership styles and the secretary's productivity.

Autocratic Leader –

Autocratic leaders assume that people are lazy, irresponsible, and untrustworthy and that planning, organizing, controlling, and decision making should be accomplished by the leader with minimal involvement from employees (Warrick 1981). Hence, this style makes people bitter and aggressive in behaviour and leads to distortion in communications, high turnover and absenteeism, and low productivity and poor work quality. It also puts employees under a lot of rules, procedures, red tape, status symbols, and working according to the dictates of the boss which makes employees dependent, less creative and afraid to seek responsibility (Warrick 1981).

Democratic Leader –

Warrick (1981), explains that this style places more emphasis on both the performance and the welfare of the employees. He explains that leaders who adopt this style assume that “most” people are honest, trustworthy, and are willing to work hard to accomplish meaningful goals and challenging work. Hence this style leads to high employee productivity, satisfaction, cooperation, and commitment, and that they are not subjected to rigorous controls and formal rules and procedures (Warrick 1981). Under this style, employees are competent and are willing to give their best, take initiative through critical thinking, communicate openly, and seek and embrace responsibilities (Warrick 1981). Furthermore, it results in low employee absenteeism and turnover.

Human Relations Leader –

Human Relations Leadership places more emphasis on the welfare of employees than on the achievement of the task (Warrick 1981). Leaders who adopt this style make an assumption that “all” people are honest, trustworthy, self motivated and would want to be involved in decision making. They also aim at making employees happy by ensuring that there is participative, permissive, and supportive work environment (Warrick 1981). However, it has been identified that this style interferes with high achievement because employees lose respect for their leaders, and that it leads to a rise of informal leaders, and frustrates goal oriented people (Warrick 1981).

Laissez Faire Leader –

Leaders who practice this style place low emphasis on performance and assume that people are unpredictable and uncontrollable and that a leader needs to keep a low profile, stay out of trouble, and leave people alone as much as possible (Warrick 1981). In addition, these leaders rely on whoever will stand out to get the job done. It is argued that employees who are subjects of this style are indifferent, disinterested, and are resentful of the organization and their leaders (Warrick 1981).

Transformational Leader –

Burns (1978), defines transformational leadership as a process that involve both leaders and followers raising one another to a higher level of morality and motivation. According to Burns (1978), a transformational leader needs to be upright in order to transform followers into leaders and moral agents. Leaders who adopt this style have strong moral values and goals which translate into behaviours and decisions that promote ethical policies, procedures, and processes within their organizations (Zhu et al. 2011). Zhu et al (2011) again stipulate that these leaders also show concern for the needs, feelings, and moral development of their followers. They are of the view that these leaders help followers improve their sense of understanding of their own moral perspective and that of others. In addition, followers are influenced in selecting information based on moral relevance from available sources. Furthermore, this style causes followers to learn how to think about their own roles, how to make their own decisions, and how to behave in accordance with their moral identity by observing leaders' morally communicating, modeling, rewarding moral actions, and engaging in moral behaviours (Zhu et al. 2011).

Transactional Leader –

These leaders use rational or economic means to monitor and control employees (Zhu et al. 2011). It is based on the principle of exchange where leaders provide tangible or intangible support and resources to followers and in return, followers give in their best in terms of efforts and performance (Zhu et al. 2011). They explain that the leader does not refrain from punishing the followers when they are unable to achieve an objective. This leadership style has the following impacts on followers: leaders who use this style monitor employees' deviation from standards, mistakes, and errors, take action when necessary leading to moral development of employees (Zhu et al. 2011). However, they are also of the view that employees led with this style act in an unethical way when put under pressure from supervisors. In addition, employees act unethically when faced with potential punishments, such as demotion, salary stagnation and humiliation (Jones and Ryan 1998).

CONCLUSION

Leadership of the public sector institutions is not attached to a particular leadership style as many people perceive it to be". Rather, it appears they use a style that will fit the situation or circumstance they face. Many secretaries and administrative assistants of the public institutions are really aware of the competences needed to perform their role. However, it appears these competences are not in use or exhibited by these categories of employees.

Way Forward

The Leaders should work hand in hand with their secretaries and create more effective/productive practices to bring about good working relationship for high productivity which ever leadership style the leader chose to use.

REFERENCES

- Azih, N. (2013) Capacity Building in Modern Office Technology: An Imperative for Effective Secretarial Productivity. *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 5(2), 193–196.
- Bass, B. M. (1999) Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 8(1), 9–32.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1997) *Full Range of Leadership Development: Manual for the Multi factor Leadership Questionnaire*. California: Mind Garden
- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A., & Dennison, P. (2003) *A review of leadership theory and competency frameworks*. Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.
- Cohn, S. (1985) Clerical labour intensity and the feminization of clerical labour in Great Britain, 1857–1937. *Social Forces*, 63(4), pp. 1060–1068.
- Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership*. NY: Harper & Row
- Dawson, C. (2009) *Introduction to research methods: A practical guide for anyone undertaking a research project*. Hachette UK
- Drath, W. & Palus, C. (1994) *Making common sense: Leadership as meaning making in communities of Practice*. Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro
- DuBrin, J. A. (1995) *Leadership*. Houghton Mifflin Company, New Jersey.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003) Transformational, transactional, and laissez faire leadership styles: a meta analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological bulletin*, 129(4), 569.
- Elenkov, D.S. (2002) Effects of leadership on organizational performance in Russian companies. *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 6, 467–480.
- Eran Vigoda Gadot, (2007) "Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 36 Iss 5 pp. 661–683
- Ezenwafor, J. I. (2013) Enhancing the relevance of secretarial staff in the university system. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 4(3), 424.
- Ezenwafor, J. I. and Okeke, A. U. (2011) Skills needed by confidential secretaries for effective performance as perceived by top civil servants. *African Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 4(1), 15–22
- France, S. (2009) *The Definitive Personal Assistant and Secretarial Handbook* –

- A bestpractice guide for all secretaries, Pas, office managers and executive assistants*. London: Koogan Page.
- Fulmar, R. M. (1977) *Practical human relations*. London: MacGraw Hill.
- García Morales, V. J., Lloréns Montes, F. J., Verdú Jover, A. J. (2008a) The effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance through knowledge and innovation. *British Journal of Management*;19(4):299–319.
- Gastil, J. (1994) A definition and illustration of democratic leadership. *Human Relations*, 47(8), 953–975.
- Goodnight, R. (2004) Laissez faire leadership. *The Economic Journal*, 98(392), 755–771. SAGE publications
- Harris, A., & Chapman, C. (2004) Democratic leadership for school improvement in challenging contexts. *Democratic Learning: The challenge to school effectiveness*, 164–178.
- Hayward, B.A., Davidson, A.J., Pascoe, J.B., Tasker, M.L, Amos, T.L. & Pearse, N.J. (2003) *The Relationship between Leadership and Employee Performance in a South African Pharmaceutical Company*. Paper presented at the Society for Industrial and Organisational Psychology 6th Annual Conference, 25–27 June 2003, Sandton, Johannesburg.
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957) *Development of the leader behavior description and measurement* (pp. 1–18). Columbus: Business Research, Ohio State University
- Higgs, M. (2003) How can we make sense of leadership in the 21st century? *Leadership & organization development journal*, 24(5), 273–284.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994) What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American psychologist*, 49(6), 493.
- House, R. J., Wright, N. S., & Aditya, R. N. (1997) Cross cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In: P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 535–625). San Francisco, CA: New Lexington
- Jablin, F. M., & Putnam, L. L. (Eds.). (2000) *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods*. Sage Publications.
- Jacobs, T. O., & Jaques, E. (1990) Military executive leadership. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 281–295). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership
- Jones, T. M., & Ryan, L.V., (1998) The effect of organizational forces on individual morality: Judgment, moral approbation & behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 8(3), 433–446.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004) Transformational and transactional leadership: a metaanalytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of applied*

- psychology*, 89(5), 755.
- Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (1999) Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. *Academy of management journal*, 42(2), 208-218.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977) *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978) *The social psychology of organization* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley
- Kruse, K. (2013) What is leadership? *Forbes*, 4 September. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kevinkruse/2013/04/09/what-is-leadership> (accessed 17 August 2016).
- Little, P. (1977) *Communication in Business* in Doctor, R. and A. Doctor, (1977). *Principles and Practice of Business Communication*, Bombay: Sheth Publishers.
- Mayer, R. E. (1977) The sequencing of instruction and the concept of assimilation to schema. *Instructional Science*, 6, 369-388
- Mullins, J. L. (1996) *Management and Organizational Behaviour*, Fourth Edition, Pitman Publishing, Pg 259.
- Mitchell, M. S., & Palmer, N. F. (2010) Understanding the managerial relevance of ethical efficacy. In M. Schminke (Ed.), *Managerial ethics: Managing the psychology of morality* (vol. 2): 89-108. New York: Routledge.
- Mullins, L. J. (2007) *Management and organisational behaviour*. Pearson education. London.
- Nsubuga, Y. K. (2008) *Analysis of leadership styles and school performance of secondary schools in Uganda* (Doctoral dissertation, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University).
- Obayi, A. U. (2009) *Office secretarial and managerial dynamics*. Enugu: PaN Afric Pubs.
- Obiruwu, T. C., Okwu, A. T. Akpa, V. O., & Nkwankwere, I. A. (2011) Effects of Leadership style on Organizational Performance. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research* Vol. 1 No 7 p100-111.
- Omotosho, J. I. (1979) *Office practice and business methods*. London: Macmillan
- Pringle, R. (1989) *Secretaries Talk: Sexuality, Power and Work*. London: Verso.
- Puni, A. Ofei, S. B. & Okoe, A. (2014) 'The effect of leadership styles on firm performance in Ghana', *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 177.
- Rauch, C. F., & Behling, O. (1984) Functionalism: Basis for an alternate approach to the study of leadership. In J. G. Hunt, Hosking, Schriesheim, & Stewart (Eds.), *Leaders and managers international perspectives on managerial behavior & leadership*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Richards, D, & Engel, S. (1986) After the vision: Suggestions for corporate visionaries and vision champions. In J. Adams (Ed.), *Transforming*

- leadership: From vision to results*: 199–214. Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Rizki, F., Armanu, T., Surachman, S. & Rofiaty, R. (2017) Study on the relationship between Islamic leadership style, work ethics, job satisfaction, and employee performance. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio Economic Sciences*, 61 (1),
- Robinson, M. & Davidson, G. (1999) *21st Century Dictionary*. New Delhi: Allied Chambers
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2012) *Research Methods for Business Students*. 6/e. Pearson Education. Harlow.
- Sethibe, T. & Steyn, R., (2016) 'The relationship between leadership style, organisational climate, innovation and organizational performance: An investigation into research methodology used', in M. Twum Darko (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business and Management Dynamics 2016: Sustainable economies in the information economy*, pp. 17–26, AOSIS, Cape Town.
- Shaw, S. and Smith, E. D. (1979) *The law of meetings: Their conduct and procedures (5th ed)*. London: Macdonald & Evans.
- Schein, E. H. (1992) *Organizational leadership and culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Verschuren, P., Doorewaard, H., & Mellion, M. J. (2010) *Designing a research project (Vol. 2)*. Eleven International Publishing. The Hague.
- Warrick, D. D. (1981) Leadership styles and their consequences. *Journal of Experiential Learning and Simulation*, 3(4), 155–172.
- Yukl, G. (2010) *Leadership in Organisations (7th ed)*. Pearson Education. New Jersey
- Yukl, G. (2012) Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 66–85.
- Zhu, W., Riggio, R. E., Avolio, B. J., & Sosik, J. J. (2011) The effect of leadership on follower moral identity: Does transformational/transactional style make a difference? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18(2), 150–163.
- Zuin, D. C.; Findlay, P. (2014) Reflections on Secretarial Work and Issues for Further Studies: A Conceptual Contribution. *Revista Gestão e Secretariado – Gesec, São Paulo*, v. 5, n. 3, p. 28–48, set. dez.