

Relationship between Leadership Styles and Productivity of Vocational and Technical Lecturers in Tertiary Institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria

K.R.E. Okoye

Professor of Electrical/Electronics Technology,
Department of Technology and Vocational Education,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

and

Ukwuoma, Annette Amaka

Department of Technology and Vocational Education,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Abstract

The study was designed to determine the relationship between leadership styles and productivity of vocational and technical lecturers in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria. Four research questions were raised and four hypotheses were tested for the study at 0.05 level of significance. The study adopted correlational research design. The entire population of 132 vocational and technical educators in public tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria was studied without sampling. Leadership Style Questionnaire (LSQ) and Lecturers' Productivity Questionnaire (LPQ) were used for data collection. Cronbach Alpha method was used to establish the reliability of the instrument which yielded coefficient of 0.89 for LSQ and 0.76 for LPQ. The researchers administered the instrument with the help of four research assistants using direct method to the respondents. Data collected were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlation statistics with SPSS version 23.0. Findings of the study revealed that there is a negative and significant relationship between autocratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity. Findings also revealed that there is a positive and significant relationship between democratic, transactional and transformational leadership styles and VTE lecturers' productivity. The null hypotheses raised for the study were rejected. The study concluded that Deans and Heads of Department must switch from one leadership style to another in order to monitor the academic leadership function of lecturers in line with the academic performance of students in vocational and technical education. The study recommended among others that vocational and technical education lecturers should not abuse the conducive working environment created by Deans and Heads of VTE Department as that may lead to organizational breakdown and swift application of rigid style of leadership

Keywords: Leadership, styles, Productivity, Vocational, Technical, Education

Introduction

Every organisation needs a leader. Leaders are managers of organisations who can predict the future probabilities and design choice strategies to satisfy uncertainties (Riaz & Haider, 2010). They can lead organizations to success by paying more attention to environmental changes, which in turn helps them set proper organizational goals and objectives (Zaidatol, Amir & Habibah, 2011). The fact that leaders lead people voluntarily without force separates them from rulers. Rulers demand followership by decree unlike leaders, who are agent of innovation and attract respect from subordinates as a result of their leadership styles. More so, the leader of an organization cannot work alone and the ability to direct, carry along and mobilize his subordinates towards attaining organizational success demands effective use of appropriate leadership styles.

Leadership styles are deliberate actions taken by leaders to see that subordinates are motivated to execute their personal visions in an organisation. According to Kiboss and Jemiryott (2014), leadership styles are the patterns of behaviour used by leaders to influence group members regarding the mission, strategy, and operations of an organisation. Memon (2014) defined leadership style as a leader's style of providing direction, motivating people and implementing plans. From literature gathered, there are numerous types of leadership style but this study will focus on autocratic leadership style, democratic leadership style, transactional leadership style and transformational leadership style.

Autocratic leadership style appears generally self-centred and allows minimum participation of subordinates in decision-making (Omeke & Onah, 2012). In the opinion of Cherry in Segun-Adeniran (2015) autocratic leadership style is based on an individual control over every decision and contributions of group members. The democratic leadership style is a direct opposite of autocratic leadership style. Mgbodile in Omeke and Onah (2012) opined that democratic leadership style is people oriented and counts on the participatory contribution of subordinates. More so, Segun-Adeniran averred that transactional leadership style usually gives subordinates' rewards or punishments for tasks carried out.

The word 'transaction' means rewards will be given for actions taken (positive or negative). Transactional leadership style also known as managerial leadership focuses on the role of oversight and group performance in which the leader promotes his followers' compliance through rewards and punishments unlike transformation leadership style (Madu, 2014). Transformational leadership style is adopted when the leader works with his subordinates to identify the necessary changes, with a mind set to guide the changes through moral guidance, and to execute the changes in accordance with his group members (Olakitan, Ali & Ishak 2017). Transformational leadership style is characterised by vision, creativity, and positive changes in an organization. It promotes high performance, increases motivation and morale among followers. A leader with transformational leadership style seeks to bring out the potentials and talents of his followers in order to improve their productivity in the organization. Productivity is one variable that determine the effectiveness of a worker in an organization.

Productivity is the result of an individual's endeavors regarding the resources used (Olakitan, Ali & Ishak, 2017). Productivity measures an individual's effectiveness and

competence in their profession. Productivity is critical for good organizational performance (Raza, Anjum & Zia, 2014), effective task performance (Yukl, 2008), resource efficiency (Rahman & Rahman, 2009), product quality, workmanship, standards compliance, customer satisfaction (Ayinde, 2014). In educational terms, Akiri and Ugborugbo (2008) opined that productivity anchors around educators' ability to impacts more on students' learning in preparing them to live a successful and productive life. This vision is echoed by the Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN) (2013) in the goals of tertiary education which stated that tertiary institutions must be able to produce graduates who are well equipped with the requisite skills to function productively in the world of work.

Generally, tertiary education is experience in Universities, colleges of education and polytechnics. Tertiary education is important because it enhances not only the intellectual potentials of students but also instils worthwhile character in them for responsible living and nation building (Ementa & Onokpaunu, 2019). There are many tertiary educational programmes offered across different faculties in a University among which is vocational and technical education. Extensively, Okoye and Okwelle (2013), conceptualized Vocational and Technical Education (VTE) as a form of education that emphasizes pragmatic attitude as a priority and advocates the development of the head (knowledge), training of hand (dexterity) and enrichment of the heart (consciousness and painstaking). The authors posited that VTE emphasizes the 3Hs (head, hand and heart) as a total deviation from the form of education, that emphasizes the 3Rs (reading, writing and arithmetic) that serve as a professional qualification for elite status with graduates roaming the streets looking for white-collar jobs.

Vocational and technical education covers agricultural education, business education, home economics, electrical and electronics technology, metalwork technology, mechanical/automobile technology, building technology and woodwork technology. Thus, VTE educators are primarily teachers of theoretical or knowledge-based components of vocational and technical education programs responsible for imparting practical and theoretical skill instruction needed in the world of work (Parsons, Hughes, Allinson & Walsh, 2009). Vocational and technical lecturers are under the leadership of their deans and heads of department in tertiary institutions. The mark of productivity among VTE lecturers is rooted in their ability to produce enterprising graduates who are job creators in the society upon graduation. However, Goodall (2009) averred that efficient leadership style leads to the realization of the goals of university education among educators and students. It is against this backdrop, the researchers sought to determine the relationship between leadership styles and productivity of vocational and technical lecturers in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

The incessant changes in the leadership positions in faculties and departments of tertiary institutions are crucial to all academic engagements and educators' productivity. In tertiary institutions, lecturers' productivity is considered in terms of teaching, preparing for class, research and scholarly activities, student research supervision, supervising internship, working with students on activities other than coursework, interacting with students outside classroom, innovation and conducting community service activities (Sullivan, Mackie, Massy & Sinha, 2012). What is certain is that, leadership styles create different organizational culture, which manifests in the productivity of employers. In Anambra State of Nigeria, there seems to be paucity of empirical investigations on the relationship between leadership styles and productivity of vocational and technical lecturers'. The gap in knowledge necessitated the researchers to

determine the relationship between autocratic leadership style, democratic leadership style, transactional leadership style and transformational leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria. With these objectives, the paper is guided by the following research questions and corresponding hypothetical statements.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between autocratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria?
2. What is the relationship between democratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria?
3. What is the relationship between transactional leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria?
4. What is the relationship between transformational leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria?
- 5.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance;

1. There is no significant relationship between autocratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.
2. There is no significant relationship between democratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.
3. There is no significant relationship between transactional leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.
4. There is no significant relationship between transformational leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Methodology

The correlational research design was adopted. This design was chosen because the researcher could not directly control the characteristics that served as independent and dependent variable in the study, since their manifestations had already occurred and hence the study was carried out in retrospect (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The population for the study consisted of all 132 vocational and technical educators in public tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria. The entire population was studied without sampling.

Two instruments were used in the study namely; Leadership Style Questionnaire (LSQ) covered the items on leadership style while Lecturers Productivity Questionnaire (LPQ) by Abba, Anumaka and Gaito (2016) covered five aspects; teaching, supervision, research and publications, innovation and community services was adopted for the study. LSQ is divided into three sections; A and B. Section A of the instrument sought information on the personal data of the respondents while Section B contained 32 items on the impact of leadership styles on

lecturers' productivity. The responses were placed on a five-point rating scale of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U) Disagree (D) and D Strongly Disagree (SD) and were rated 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. The validation of the instruments was done by subjecting it to one expert each from the Department of Educational Foundation and Vocational and Technical Education of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. To establish the instruments reliability, it was administered on 20 VTE lecturers in Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu State who are not part of the actual study. Using Cronbach's alpha, a reliability coefficient alpha of 0.89 for LSQ and 0.76 for LPQ. The researchers administered the instrument with the help of four research assistants using direct method to the respondents. Pearson product-moment correlation statistics were used for data analysis at 0.05 level of significance. A hypothesis was accepted where the p-value is equal to or greater than the alpha level of 0.05 ($p > 0.05$), at a degree of freedom; on the other hand, the null hypothesis was rejected when a p-value was less than the alpha level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). The analysis was carried out using SPSS version 23.0.

Results

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between autocratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria?

Table 1: Correlational between autocratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity

Variables	Pearson Correlation coefficient (<i>r</i>)
Autocratic leadership style	-0.27
Lecturers' productivity	

Table 1 shows a Pearson coefficient (*r*) of -0.27, which indicates a negative relationship between autocratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity. Data in Table 1 further shows a negative and low relationship between autocratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between democratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria?

Table 2: Correlations between democratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity

Variables	Pearson Correlation coefficient (<i>r</i>)
Democratic leadership style	0.82
Lecturers' productivity	

Table 2 shows a Pearson coefficient (*r*) of 0.82 that indicates a positive relationship between democratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity. Data in Table 2 shows a positive and high relationship between democratic

leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between transactional leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria?

Table 3: Correlations between transactional leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity

Variables	Pearson Correlation coefficient (<i>r</i>)
Transactional leadership style	0.63
Lecturers' productivity	

Table 3 shows a Pearson coefficient (*r*) of 0.63 that indicates a positive relationship between transactional leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity. Data in Table 3 further shows a positive and moderate relationship between transactional leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between transformational leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria?

Table 4: Correlations between transformational leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity

Variables	Pearson Correlation coefficient (<i>r</i>)
Transformational leadership style	0.76
Lecturers' productivity	

Table 4 shows a Pearson coefficient (*r*) of 0.76 that indicates a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity. Data in Table 4 further shows there is positive and high relationship between transformational leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Hypotheses testing

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between autocratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Table 5: summary of correlation co-efficient of the relationship between autocratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity

Variables	<i>R</i>	p-value	Remark
Autocratic leadership style			
	-0.27	0.00	S
Lecturers productivity			
<i>S – Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance</i>			

Data in Table 5 reveal that there is a significant relationship between autocratic leadership style and VTE lecturers productivity ($r = -0.27$, $p < 0.05$) and the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between democratic leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria

Table 6: summary of correlation co-efficient of the relationship between democratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity

Variables	<i>R</i>	p-value	Remark
Democratic leadership style			
	0.82	0.00	S
Lecturers' productivity			
<i>S – Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance</i>			

Data in Table 6 reveals that there is a significant relationship between democratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity ($r = 0.82$, $p < 0.05$) and the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between transactional leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers' productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria

Table 7: summary of correlation co-efficient of the relationship between transactional leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity

Variables	<i>R</i>	p-value	Remark
Transactional leadership style			
	0.63	0.00	S
Lecturers' productivity			
<i>S – Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance</i>			

Data in Table 7 reveals that there is a significant relationship between transactional leadership style and VTE lecturers productivity ($r = -0.63$, $p < 0.05$) and the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant relationship between transformational leadership style and vocational and technical education lecturers 'productivity in tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria

Table 8: summary of correlation co-efficient of the relationship between transformational leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity

Variables	R	p-value	Remark
Transformational leadership style	0.76	0.00	S
Lecturers' productivity			

S – Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance

Data in Table 8 reveals that there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity ($r = 0.76$, $p < 0.05$) and the null hypothesis is rejected.

Discussion of findings

The study reveals a negative relationship between autocratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity. This implies when Deans and HODs of VTE department uses autocratic leadership style, VTE lecturers 'exhibit unproductive attitude towards their official duties. Therefore, the null hypothesis that, there is no statistical significant relationship between autocratic leadership style and lecturers productivity was rejected. This finding is similar to Jayasingam and Cheng (2009) where they found autocratic power produces negative influence on employee job performance. The studies of Akor (2014) and Puni, Ofei and Okoe (2014) support the finding that there is a negative and significant relationship between autocratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity. This means that as the autocratic leadership style of Deans and HODs increases, there is an equal decrease in the level of job productivity among VTE lecturers. However, the study findings are inconsistent with the earlier study of Gimuguni, Nandutu and Magolo (2014) which reported positive relationship between autocratic leadership styles and employees 'performance.

In addition, the study also discovered a positive relationship between democratic leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity. This implies when Deans and HODs of VTE department uses democratic leadership style, VTE lecturers 'exhibit professional efficiency towards their job. Therefore, the null hypothesis that, there is no statistical significant relationship between democratic leadership style and lecturers productivity was rejected. This finding is similar to Ojokuku, Odetayo and Sajuyigbe (2012) which reported that democratic leadership style permits workers to have sense of belonging, higher responsibility with little supervision, which enhances organizational efficiency. This had been supported by the studies of

Iqbal, Anwar and Haider (2015) and Bhatti, Maitlo, Shaikh, Hasmi and Shaikh (2012). This means that as the democratic leadership style of Deans and HODs increases, there is a corresponding increase in the level of job productivity and organizational growth by lecturers in tertiary institutions.

Furthermore, outcome of the study disclosed that transactional leadership style strongly and positively correlated with lecturers' productivity. This implies when Deans and HODs of VTE department uses transactional leadership style, it brings cordiality and closeness between the leader and subordinates, which leads to increased productivity. This means that as the transactional leadership style of Deans and HODs increases, VTE lecturers have a clearer understanding of their given task especially when promotion and other incentives are at stake. Therefore the null hypothesis that, there is no statistical significant relationship between transactional leadership style and lecturers' productivity was rejected. These results are similar to the findings of Valdiserri and Wilson (2010) whose study found that transactional leaders are able to produce a positive atmosphere, and inspire and motivate their employees to perform at a higher level. The finding that there is a significant relationship between transactional leadership style and VTE lecturers' productivity is in agreement with the studies of Giltinane (2013) and Akhigbe, Ajiyenka, and Oloda (2014) which reported that transactional leadership style is task-oriented, give reward based on performances and has positive relationship with subordinates' job performance and satisfaction

Finally, the study discovered that transformational leadership style strongly and positively correlated with lecturers' productivity. This implies when Deans and HODs of VTE department uses transformational leadership style, VTE lecturers' exhibit professional efficiency towards their job. This means that as the transformational leadership style of Deans and HODs increases, there is a corresponding increase in the level of job productivity and organizational growth by lecturers in tertiary institutions. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no statistical significant relationship between transformational leadership style and lecturers' productivity was rejected. Significant positive relationship between transformational leadership styles and lecturers' productivity is also reported in the study of Pradeep and Prabhu (2011) in India, and in the studies of Ejere and Abasilim (2013) and Kehinde and Banjo (2014) in Nigeria. The finding that transformational leadership style strongly and positively correlated with lecturers' productivity tallies with the assertion of Anyango (2015) who stated that transformational leaders focus on employees from an individualized perspective increases their productivity on the job.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Leadership style is the framework for accomplishing successful leadership roles. Although, leadership is dynamic and its role in the success and failure of an organization cannot be over-emphasized. Based on the findings of the study, it is crystal clear that different leadership styles have positive and negative significant impact on productivity. Upon this foundation, the researchers concluded that, Deans and Heads of Department must switch from one leadership style to another in order to monitor the academic leadership function of lecturers in line with the academic performance of students in vocational and technical education. Hence, the researchers suggested the following recommendations:

1. Deans and Heads of VTE Department should use democratic and transformational leadership styles so as to promote the overall productivity of lecturers and in turn improves the academic achievement of students in vocational and technical studies.

2. Deans and Heads of VTE Department should resist the urge to adopt autocratic and transactional leadership styles because they are not suitable for improving the productivity, commitment and joy of teaching among lecturers in tertiary institutions.
3. Vocational and technical education lecturers should not abuse the conducive working environment created by Deans and Heads of VTE Department that may lead to organizational breakdown and swift application of rigid style of leadership

References

- Abba, H.D., Anumaka, I.B., &Gaito, S.S. (2016). Leadership Practices and Productivity of Academic Staff in Polytechnics in Nigeria. *American Journal of Academic Research*, 1, 56 - 68.
- Akhigbe, O.J., Ajioka, M.F., &Oloda, O.F. (2014). Transactional leadership style and employee satisfaction in Nigerian banking sector. *European journal of business and management*, vol. 6, 2014.
- Akiri, A.A. &Ugborugbo, N. M. (2008). An examination of gender's influence on teachers' productivity in secondary schools. *J. Soc. Sci.*, 17(3), 185-191
- Akor, P.U. (2014). Influence of autocratic leadership style on the job performance of academic librarians in Benue State. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(7), 148-152
- Anyango, C.A. (2015). *Effects of leadership styles on employee performance at BOA Kenya Limited*. Unpublished masters' dissertation, Department of Human Resources Management, Open University of Tanzania
- Ayinde, H. (2014). Employee welfare programmes: Panacea towards improving labour productivity in the service sector in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(10), 78-81
- Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G.M., Shaikh, N., Hasmi, M.A., &, Shaikh, F.M., (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style. *International Business Research*, 5(2), 192-201
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007) *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge
- Ejere, E.I., &Abasilim, U.D. (2013). Impact of transactional and transformational leadership styles on organisational performance: Empirical evidence from Nigeria. *The Journal of Commerce*, 5(1), 30-41
- Ementa, N.C., &Onokpaunu, M.O. (2019). Appraisal of business education students' performance trends in computer related courses: Implications for lecturers' instructional design. *Nigerian Journal of Business Education*,6(1), 397 – 410
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2013).National Policy on Education.Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Goodall, A.H. (2009). Highly cited leaders and the performance of research universities. *Research Policy*, 38(7), 1079-1092
- Gimuguni, L., Nandutu, J., &Magolo, A. (2014). *Effect of leadership styles on performance of local governments in Uganda. A case of Mbale District*. Unpublished masters' thesis, Department of Business Management, Makerere University

- Iqbal, N., Anwar, S. & Haider, N., (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(5), 1- 6
- Giltinane, C.L. (2013). Leadership styles and theories. *Nursing Standard*, 21, 35-39.
- Jayasingam, S., & Cheng, M.Y. (2009). Leadership style and perception of effectiveness: Enlightening Malaysian managers. *Asian social science*, 5(2), 54-65
- Kiboss, J.K., & Jemiryott, H.K.S. (2014). Relationship between principals' leadership styles and secondary school teachers' job satisfaction in Nandi South District, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 3(2), 493-509
- Kehinde, O.A.I., & Banjo, H.A. (2014). Test of the impact of leadership styles on employee performance: A study of department of petroleum resources. *International Journal of Management of Sciences*, 2(3), 149–160
- Madu, N.P. (2014). *Impact of leadership style on the performance of selected transport companies in Benue State, Nigeria*. Unpublished masters' thesis, Department of Business Administration, University of Nigeria, Enugu
- Memon, K.R. (2014). Effects of leadership styles on employee performance: Integrating the mediating role of culture, Gender and moderating role of communication. *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research*, 3(7), 63 - 80
- Michael. A. (2010). *Leadership style and organizational impact*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala-apa.org>
- Ojokuku, R., Odetayo, T. & Sajuyigbe, A., (2012). Impact of leadership style on organizational performance: A case study of Nigerian banks. *American Journal of Business and Management*, 1(4), 202-207
- Olakitan, O.J., Ali, H., & Ishak, S.B. (2017). Impact of principal leadership style and teacher quality on teacher's productivity: A Conceptual paper. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(10), 83 - 89
- Okoye, K.R.E, & Okwelle, P.C. (2013). Technical and vocational and training (TVET) in Nigeria and energy development, marketing and national transformation. *J. Educ. Pract.*, 4(14), 134-138
- Omeke, F.C., & Onah K. A. (2012). The influence of principals' leadership styles on secondary school teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(9), 45 – 52
- Parsons, D., Hughes, J., Allinson, C., & Walsh, K. (2009). The training and development of VET teachers and trainers in Europe. In Cedefop (Ed.), *Modernising vocational education and training, fourth report on vocational education and training research in Europe: Synthesis report* (pp. 71–141). Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

- Pradeep, D. D., &Prabhu, N. R. V. (2011). The relationship between effective leadership and employee performance. *Journal of Advancements in Information Technology*, 20, 198-207
- Puni, A., Ofei. S.B., &Okoe, A. (2014). The effect of leadership styles on firm performance in Ghana. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 6(1), 177 - 185
- Rahman, S., & Rahman, M. (2009). Impact of land fragmentation and resource ownership on productivity and efficiency: The case of rice producers in Bangladesh. *Land Use Policy*, 26(1), 95- 103.
- Raza, H., Anjum, M., & Zia, S. M. (2014). The impacts of employee's job performance behaviour and organisational culture on organisational productivity in pharmaceutical industries in Karachi. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(12), 285-400
- Riaz, A., & Haider, M. H. (2010). Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and career satisfaction. *Business and Economic Horizons*, 1(1), 29-38
- Segun-Adeniran, C.D. (2015), Leadership styles and job productivity of university library staff: Interrogating the Nexus. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 1269.
- Sullivan, T. A., Mackie, C., Massy, W. F., & Sinha, E. (2012). *Improving measurement of productivity in higher education*. New York, USA: National Academy of Sciences.
- Valdiserri, G.A., & Wilson, J.L. (2010). The study of leadership in small business organizations: Impact on profitability and organizational success. *The Entrepreneurial Executive*, 15 – 47
- Zaidatol, A.L.P., Amir, S., &Habibah, E. (2011). Analysis of heads of department leadership styles: Implication for improving research university management practices. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1081 – 1090