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ABSTRACT

Research on leadership has a long tradition, but research that purely reflects African perspectives of leadership is yet to witness rapid growth. Within this context, the aim of this study is to explore and propose a culture-fit theoretical model that provides a good understanding of leadership in the Nigerian private sector. Considering the vastness of the leadership phenomenon, the research chose to investigate a leadership theory known as Servant Leadership that has gained wide research attention in most cultures, except Africa. To achieve this aim, this research attempts to investigate the extent to which servant leadership characteristics and personal leader traits influence employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness in Nigerian private sector companies. Having done this, it would then examine the effects of demographic variables on the application of servant leadership as a means of enhancing job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour in Nigerian private sector companies within the scope of the effects of culture. This study adopted a mixed methods approach. A questionnaire survey was conducted, and data were collected from 285 employees of private sector companies. In addition, 20 business leaders were interviewed. In this study, data were quantitatively analysed with the use of the statistical software of SPSS version 23. The findings suggest servant leadership characteristics as a predictor of leadership effectiveness, a positive relationship between the employee demographic variables of gender, age, work experience and staff positions to job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour. This study found cultures of enforcement and compliance, in practice, yet the model shows how a re-enactment of the traditional African value systems could lead to servant leadership practice in Nigerian private sector companies. The key contribution of this study is that this is the first study that develops a culture-fit theoretical model exploring the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector. It also increases understanding of the relationships between servant leadership characteristics, job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour, and culture in relation to Nigeria. The positive implication of this research is that it would lead to a renaissance of leadership research in Africa as it would inform the academic body of knowledge and international researchers on Africa’s leadership perspectives. The model could also be used as a learning platform for business students on leadership in Africa. This study would help re-orientate organisational leaders in Africa, foreign investors and labour policy makers in Nigeria.
DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my Parents (Prof Steve and Prof (Mrs) Rita Okecha), for their undying support vast investment towards my education. It is also dedicated to my brothers, Olise, Otuya, Uche, and my only sister, the jewel of my home, Keli for inspiring me on a consistent basis on my academic journey.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude goes to the Almighty God and my Lord Jesus Christ for grace, strength and provision, since the commencement of this research in September 2015. How do I start to express my gratitude to my supervisor, who I do not only see as a supervisor, but as a mentor and in my most trying circumstances, a father figure. I wish to express my most sincere gratitude to Professor Mohamed Branine for his academic guidance and inspiring support towards my PhD, and exemplifying himself as a man of unparalleled discipline, integrity and honour. His patience, encouragement and style of correction is a dynamic example that will help me in the very near future.

I am also thankful to the academic community at Abertay University for providing some platforms to enable me boost my academic goals. My gratitude also goes to my very close friends and family members who have encouraged me on this journey; Godfrey Bassey, Deon, Chervon, Daniel, Gavin and Amy, Jean-Baptiste, Ying, Lei lei, Max and Anna Coutoure, Malcolm and Ruth Farquhar, Crawford and Sheila, Abass Malik, Dr. Segun and Dr Yewande Olupitan, Stella Okecha. I wish to really thank Johnson Okeniyi, Sunday Enejo, Millicent, Juliette, Sydney, Hanan, Mide, Mercedes, Kanya, Ftepti, Raji, Emmanuel for not only being good colleagues but inspiring friends on this academic journey. The true concern from my friends at Friends International and the Shodokan Aikido dojo is highly appreciated. They were always concerned about how I was faring academically.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation to all the participants in this research and the HR managers and business leaders who gave me access as required to their employees.
# LIST OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE PAGE</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECLARATION</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background ........................................................................ 1
1.2 Statement of the Problem ............................................... 3
1.3 Research Aim and Objectives ........................................... 5
1.4 Research Hypotheses ..................................................... 5
1.5 Research Methodology .................................................... 6
1.6 The Scope of the Study ................................................ 7

1.7 **Structure of the Thesis** ........................................... 9

## Chapter Two: The Socio-Economic and Political Context of Nigeria

2.1 Introduction ..................................................................... 11
2.2 Validation of Nigeria for this Study ................................ 11
2.3 General Background Information about Nigeria .................. 12
2.4 The Socio-Cultural Context ........................................... 14
2.5 The Economic Context .................................................. 18

2.5.1 *Summary of Economic Reforms in Nigeria* .................... 21
2.5.2 *The Relevance of Private Sector to Nigeria’s Economic Growth* 24
2.6 The Political Context ................................................ 30

2.6.1 *The Interplay between Religion and Politics in Nigeria* .. 32
2.7 Private Sector Enterprises in Nigeria ................................ 33
2.8 Conclusion ........................................................................ 34

## Chapter Three: Servant Leadership - A Conceptual Analysis

3.1 Introduction ..................................................................... 36
3.2 Historical Background and Definitions of Leadership .......... 36
3.3 The Rationale behind Servant Leadership ......................... 40

3.3.1 *Classical Leadership* ............................................... 41
3.3.1.1 *Autocratic Leadership* ......................................... 41
3.3.1.2 *Democratic Leadership* ....................................... 42

3.3.1.3 *Collective Leadership* ........................................ 43
3.3.1.4 Laissez-faire Leadership.................................................................44
3.3.2 Contemporary Leadership............................................................45
3.3.2.1 Charismatic Leadership...............................................................45
3.3.2.2 Transformational Leadership........................................................46
3.3.2.3 Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)..................................................47
3.3.2.4 Transformational Leadership........................................................48
3.3.2.5 Authentic Leadership................................................................. Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.3.2.6 Ethical Leadership.........................................................................49
3.3.2.7 Spiritual Leadership.......................................................................50
3.3.2.8 Authentic Leadership....................................................................51
3.4 Servant Leadership.............................................................................53
3.4.1 Validation of Origin.........................................................................54
3.4.2 Definitions of Servant Leadership.....................................................55
3.4.3 Servant Leadership Dimensions and Characteristics........................58
3.5.1 Functional Attributes.......................................................................67
3.5.2 Accompanying Attributes.................................................................70
3.6 Conclusion.........................................................................................74

Chapter Four: Leadership Theories – A theoretical analysis........................77
4.1 Introduction......................................................................................77
4.2 Evolution of Leadership Theories.......................................................77
4.3 Leadership Theory- Trait Perspective...............................................79
4.3.1 Application of the Trait Theory......................................................82
4.3.2 Criticisms of the Trait Theory.........................................................85
4.4 Leadership Theory- Behavioural Perspective....................................87
4.4.1 The Autocratic or Directive Leadership Approach.............................88
4.4.1.1 Application of Autocratic Leadership Approach...........................90
4.4.1.2 Criticisms of Autocratic Leadership Approach............................94
4.4.2 The Democratic or Participative Leadership Approach..................95
4.4.2.1 Application of Democratic Leadership Approach.......................97
4.4.2.2 Criticisms of Democratic Leadership Approach..........................100
4.4.3 The Laissez-Faire Leadership Theory............................................100
4.4.3.1 Application of Laissez-Faire Leadership Theory..........................101
4.5 Application of the Behavioural Theory of Leadership........................106
4.5.1 Ohio State University Study.........................................................106
4.5.1.2 Criticisms of the Ohio State Leadership Studies.........................109
4.5.2 University of Michigan Behavioural Leadership Study..................110
4.5.3 Leadership Grid Theory.................................................................113
4.5.4 The Fiedler’s Contingency Theory.................................................116
Chapter Five: Leadership – the servant perspective. .......................................................... 144

5.1 Application of Servant Leadership ............................................................................ 145
5.1.1 Application of Servant Leadership ........................................................................ 145
5.1.1.2 Criticisms of Servant Leadership Theory ............................................................ 151
5.2 Ubuntu Leadership Theory - An African Perspective .................................................. 153
5.2.1 Application of the Ubuntu Leadership Theory ......................................................... 155
5.2.1.2 Criticisms of the Ubuntu Leadership Theory ......................................................... 158
5.3 Leadership and Culture .............................................................................................. 159
5.3.1 National Cultural Dimensions- Hofstede’s perspective ......................................... 161
5.4 The GLOBE Study and Leadership- African Context ................................................ 166
5.4.1 Application of the GLOBE project in Africa and Other Cultures ............................ 170
5.5 Servant Leadership, Ubuntu and Culture: The development of hypotheses and a theoretical framework ............................................................ 175

Figure 5.1: Postulated Conceptual Framework ................................................................. 181
5.6 Conclusion .................................................................................................................. 182

Chapter Six: Research Methodology ............................................................................ 183

6.2 Aim and Objectives .................................................................................................. 184
6.3 Research Hypotheses ................................................................................................. 185
6.4 Research Philosophy ................................................................................................. 185
6.4.1 Research Paradigm ................................................................................................. 186
6.4.2 Epistemological Assumption .................................................................................. 189
6.4.3 Ontological Assumption ......................................................................................... 189
6.4.4 Axiological Assumptions ....................................................................................... 191
6.4.5 Rhetorical Assumption ......................................................................................... 192
6.4.6 Methodological Assumption .................................................................................. 192
6.4.7 Research Approach ............................................................................................... 193
Chapter Seven: Analysis and Presentation of the Findings.......................................................... 215

7.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 215
7.2 Respondents' Profiles ....................................................................................................... 216
7.3 Servant Leadership Characteristics and Employees' Perceptions of Leadership Effectiveness .............................................................. 218
7.4 Demographic Variables and the Impact of Leadership on Job Satisfaction ................. 234
7.4.1 Perceptions of gender of the impact of servant leadership on job satisfaction .... 236
7.5 Demographic Variables and the Application of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour ................................................................. 261
7.5.3 Work Experiences, Servant Leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) .................................................................................................................. 271
7.5.4 Respondents Positions, Servant Leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) .............................................................. 276
7.6 Culture and Servant Leadership ..................................................................................... 281
7.7 Servant Leadership and Employee Performance ............................................................. 292
7.8 Conclusion ......................................................................................................................... 297

Chapter Eight: Discussion of the Findings .............................................................................. 300

8.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 300
8.2 Servant Leadership Characteristics and Leadership Effectiveness. ............................... 300
8.3 Servant Leadership in relation to Job Satisfaction and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour ................................................................................................. 306
8.4 Culture and Servant Leadership ..................................................................................... 308
8.5 Servant Leadership and Employee Performance ............................................................. 314
8.6 The Development of a Theoretical Model ..................................................................... 318
8.6 Conclusion .................................................................................................................. 320

Chapter Nine: Conclusion .............................................................................................. 322
9.1 Introduction ................................................................................................................ 322
9.2 Summary of the main issues ...................................................................................... 322
9.3 Contribution of the Study to Knowledge .................................................................. 326
9.3.1 Contribution to Theory ......................................................................................... 326
9.3.2 Contribution to Practice ....................................................................................... 329
9.4 Limitations of the study ............................................................................................ 331
9.5 Proposals for Further Research ................................................................................ 332

References ....................................................................................................................... 333

Appendix 1.1: Factor Analysis (Using the bivariate correlation matrix) ......................... 384
Appendix 2.1: Factor Analysis (Using the bivariate correlation matrix) ......................... 388
LIST OF TABLES

Table 6.1: Overview of reliability and internal consistency measures from the study..198
Table 6.2: Justification for selecting the companies studied...........................................198
Table 7.2.1: Respondents Profiles....................................................................................205
Table 7.3.1: Servant Leadership Characteristics and Employees’ Perceptions of Leadership Effectiveness ..............................................................................................208
Table 7.4.1: Perceptions of Gender of the Impact of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction......................................................................................................................223
Table 7.4.2: Perceptions Using Respondents’ Age on the impact of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction...........................................................................................................231
Table 7.4.3: Perceptions Using the Work Experience of Respondents on the Impact of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction.................................................................238
Table 7.4.4: Perceptions using the Staff Positions of Respondents on the Impact of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction......................................................................................244
Table 7.5.1: Perceptions using the Gender of and the Application of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)......................................................................................................................250
Table 7.5.2: Perceptions Using the Age of Respondents and the Application of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)......................................................................................................258
Table 7.5.3: Perceptions Using the Work Experiences of Respondents and the Application of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)......................................................................................................263
Table 7.5.4: Perceptions Using Respondents Positions and the Application of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)......................................................................................................267
Table 7.6.1: Respondents’ Perception to Culture and Servant Leadership.......................273
Table 7.6.2: Respondents’ Perception to Ubuntu and Servant Leadership.........................275
Table 7.6.3: Pearson’s correlation test for hypothesis 3......................................................278
Table 7.7.1: Servant Leadership and Employee Performance...........................................283
Table 7.7.2: Pearson’s correlation test for hypothesis 4......................................................284
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: The political map of Nigeria.................................................................13
Figure 2.2: Hierarchy of Nigeria's Political Governance......................................17
Figure 2.3: Chart depicting the GDP per capita and the average living standards in Nigeria from early to current leadership...............................................................20
Figure 2.4: An overview of Nigeria’s GDP growth from 2005 – anticipated 2023.................................................................................................................................22
Figure 5.1: Postulated Conceptual Framework......................................................170
Figure 8.1: Theoretical Model for exploring the role of Servant Leadership in Nigerian Private Sector Companies.................................................................306
Chapter One: Introduction

“Moral authority is another way to define servant leadership because it represents a reciprocal choice between leader and follower. If the leader is principle centred, he or she will develop moral authority. If the follower is principle centred, he or she will follow the leader. In this sense, both leaders and followers are followers. Why? They follow truth. They follow natural law. They follow principles. They follow a common, agreed-upon vision. They share values. They grow to trust one another”. Robert Greenleaf (2002, p.5)

1.1 Background

This study explores the role of servant leadership in the Nigerian private sector companies. For centuries, traditional beliefs have upheld the term “servant” to connote an individual of lower position. Therefore, a major issue that has dominated the field of leadership concerns a unique approach to leadership in which the primary goal of the leader is to serve those led. However, in recent times, considerable literature has emerged around the theme of what is now known as ‘Servant Leadership’ (Greenleaf, 1977). Even though the term ‘servant’ and ‘leader’ when put together, seem to have paradoxical anecdotes, researchers are showing increased interest in studying the servant leadership theory. My primary interest in the subject of servant leadership draws back to when I undertook my Master’s program at the University of Wales and my dissertation focused on employee motivation and morale in the educational sector of Nigeria (Okecha, 2011). I found that a dominant factor that influenced employee motivation and morale was Leadership. Following this research, I had the opportunity to work in a few private sector companies and I developed an inner passion to understudy the phenomenon of leadership. This resulted to having an inquisitive mind seeking to explore if there is a specific leadership theory that could improve leadership ineffectiveness in the Nigerian private sector. Having come across Greenleaf’s first published article on the concept of “Servant Leadership”, I became determined to
investigate how this new school of leadership thinking could relate to Africa by looking at the Nigerian private sector companies.

Research on leadership has a long tradition and many attempts have been made to ensure continuity of research on leadership. In consequence of this, traditional theories of leadership (Peterson, 1997) have given way to more contemporary leadership theories (Abbasiyannejad and Silong, 2015; Antonakis and Day, 2017). One of the major theories of leadership that is gaining a lot of research attention is servant leadership that is attributed to Greenleaf (Spears, 1996; Patterson, 2003; Stone, Russell and Patterson, 2004; Spears and Lawrence, 2016; Sousa and Van Dierendonck, 2017; Harju, Schaufeli and Hakanen, 2018). Greenleaf’s definition of servant leadership is as follows:

“The Servant-Leader is servant first…. It begins with a natural feeling that one wants to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead…The best test, and difficult to administer is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in the society? Will they benefit, or at least not further be harmed?” (1977, p. 13).

Also, researchers like Spears (1996) agreed that servant leadership represents a new leadership school of thought that places serving others as dominant priority. Similarly, Patterson (2003) argued that Servant Leadership is an emergent leadership style that has high emphasis on service to followers, a holistic approach to work and one that upholds a sense of alliance and participation in decision-making processes. However, only a few studies have investigated the concept of servant leadership from an African perspective. More importantly, to the knowledge of the researcher, there is no previous research that has yielded to an in-depth examination of servant leadership in relation to the Nigerian private sector.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Even though there is growing research on servant leadership, up to now, far too little attention has been paid to the study of servant leadership in Africa. This is attributed to the eminent problem of the insufficiency of research on leadership in Africa (Msila, 2016).

Furthermore, the effects of servant leadership on the Nigerian private sector has not been closely examined. Whilst acknowledging the contribution of different scholars to the theory and practice of leadership, Muchiri (2011) identified a gap in researchers advancing scholarly activity of leadership theory in Africa. This corroborates with the views of Gray, Shrestha and Nkansah (2008) who did not only claim the existence of a gap in the literature on leadership theory in Africa, but also argued that management scholars’ apparent confidence in their use of western cultural models of management to analyse management practices in African countries could be misleading.

Similarly, Lituchy, Ford and Punnett (2013) argued that management and organisation issues such as leadership have been studied to a very limited degree in developing countries (like Nigeria), and corresponded their view with that of Baruch (2001) and Bruton (2010) who stated that management knowledge is rigorously influenced by western perspectives.

In addition, no study to my knowledge has considered investigation of servant leadership in the Nigerian private sector. This study has been undertaken in order to generate fresh insights into leadership theory from an African perspective. It would achieve this by undertaking an exploratory analysis of the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. Therefore, this research proposes to develop a theoretical model that would provide a deeper understanding of the applicability of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies and other African countries.
Much uncertainty still exists about the presence of effective business leaders across organisations in Africa. Since the majority of these leaders are customer-centric (i.e., focus on their customers) and revenue rather than the needs of their employees the effectiveness of their leadership is questioned (Hunter, 2016). Many business leaders in Africa have not been able to advance leadership effectiveness because they have cultivated ethical behaviours that do not meet employees’ expectations (Engelbrecht and Wolmarans, 2017).

A significant challenge facing leadership in African organisations is that the majority of business leaders demonstrate leadership styles which do not translate to an increase in employees’ job satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviour, motivation and morale, as well as the employees’ performance; and this could be best termed as “leadership deficit” (Sebudubudu and Bothomilwe, 2012).

An early vivid illustration of the business leader in Africa was given by Kiggundu (1988, p. 226) who stated:

“There is an acute shortage of quality leadership and management in Africa. Prevailing management styles are authoritarian, personalized, politicized, and not conducive to management development and the emergence of new leadership. Entrepreneurial, creative, and development talents are suppressed in favour of bureaucratic, risk-aversive administration based on absolute obedience.”

It is evident that not much has changed since then and that the problem needs to be re-examined.
1.3 Research Aim and Objectives

In exploring the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies, the principal aim of this study is to develop a theoretical model that would provide better understanding of leadership as it relates to Nigerian private sector companies. In order to achieve this aim, the following objectives have to be met:

1. To investigate the extent to which servant leadership characteristics and personal leader traits influence employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness in Nigerian private sector companies;

2. To examine the effects of demographic variables on the effect of servant leadership as a means of enhancing job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour in Nigerian private sector companies;

3. To analyse the effects of culture on the application of servant leadership; and

4. To understand the impact of servant leadership on employee performance, having achieved objectives 1 to 3.

1.4 Research Hypotheses

To meet the above stated research objectives, a review of extensive literature has resulted in the development of the following hypotheses:

\( H_1 \) - There is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/person leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness;

\( H_{2a} \) - There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and staff positions) and the effect of servant leadership on job satisfaction;
**H2b** - There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and staff positions) and the effect of servant leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour;

**H3** - There is a positive relationship between the effects of culture and the application of servant leadership; and

**H4** - There is a positively significant relationship between employee performance and servant leadership.

### 1.5 Research Methodology

As it will be explained in more details later in chapter five, this study adopts a mixed method approach for data research and collection. According to Creswell and Clark (2007), mixed methods approach is founded upon the belief that different paradigms and methods have different strengths and, for certain situations, their combined strength would result in improving the depth and accuracy of the findings. According to Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, (2004), the mixed methods strategy has no anticipation to replace quantitative and qualitative approaches but to rather utilise the pros and neglect the cons of the two approaches. This view corresponds with Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Jackson (2015) who argued that the philosophical differences in qualitative and quantitative research strategies make it important to deploy a mixed method in research.

Therefore, in adopting the mixed methods for this study, the researcher anticipates that the research would benefit from the advantages of using both the qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection and analysis and hence to ensure validity and reliability in the analysis of the variables constructed from the research.
This study employed a positivist approach by conducting questionnaire surveys in Lagos, the largest city in Nigeria, and Abuja, the federal capital of Nigeria. It utilised a purposive sampling method. The questionnaires were distributed to 394 employees at different positions of the private companies from different business activities ranging from technology to education. The number of completed questionnaires received was 285, making a response rate of 72%. Upon collection of the questionnaires, data were analysed using the SPSS version 23 which is an effective instrument in developing descriptive statistical data (Green and Salkind, 2016).

Moreover, the study has also utilised semi-structured interviews to collect qualitative data from 20 business leaders who were selected based on their known successful business and leadership effectiveness in Nigeria. By adopting qualitative and quantitative research strategies (using the mixed methods approach), this study attempts to illuminate the research aim through this holistic approach.

1.6 The Scope of the Study

This research has provided an important opportunity to advance the understanding of servant leadership from an African perspective. It makes a significant contribution to research by investigating and demonstrating the factors that need to be put into consideration if servant leadership is to be applicable in Nigerian private sector companies. There are several important areas where this study makes an original contribution to knowledge, in theory and in practice as it will be discussed in more details in the concluding chapter of this thesis.

Among the main contributions of this study to knowledge is its attempt to provide an understanding of how servant leadership is applicable in Nigeria. It also broadens the scope of leadership research from an African perspective. It is the first exploratory and
explanatory study, to the best of my knowledge, on the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. It also provides a new approach to the understanding of the effect of culture on servant leadership in Nigeria.

The originality of this research can be represented in the research question of: Does servant leadership exist in Nigerian private sector companies? After reviewing the relevant literature and developing the research hypotheses, research findings, the study has provided a novel perspective of servant leadership, which is presented in collecting and analysing the data, and then the discussion of a theoretical model. This model identifies key moderating and mediating factors and shows a practical way for servant leadership practice in Nigerian private sector companies.

The findings of this research have also implications for an extensive range of stakeholders in the private sector in leadership capacity as it will serve as an instructional platform for organisational leaders. Furthermore, on a macro (national) level, the findings of this study would equip labour decision and policy makers on servant leadership practice. Another practical contribution is that it would provide a reorientation on leadership thinking processes across all sectors of industry in Nigeria and elsewhere in the African continent.

The findings of this research will be of interest to foreign investors as they will serve as a prototype for investors who aspire to establish servant leadership as their organisational core operating strategy. Moreover, management and leadership researchers would have the opportunity to gain information for their comparative studies that relate the context of Nigeria to other countries. It would also extend the context of leadership programmes in business schools on leadership in Africa. In addition, leadership consultants would find this research also useful for developing models of good practice in leadership in Africa.
1.7 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis comprises of eight chapters as follows:

Chapter 1 represents a general introduction to the study. It commences by discussing the researcher’s motivation behind the conduct of the study. In addition, it provides the rationale of the study, presents the problem statement of the research, the research aim and objectives, and a summary the methodology used in the study.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the socio-economic and political context of Nigeria. It presents a contextual background of the social, political, cultural and economic framework of Nigeria. The chapter also focuses on the emergence of privatisation and the development of the private sector companies in recent years. This chapter is significant for the understanding of the effects of economics, culture and politics on leadership and management practice in the African context.

Chapter 3 is the first phase of the literature review. It begins by introducing the historical backgrounds and definitions of leadership and leadership theories. It then goes on to present a conceptual overview of servant leadership theory by examining the definitions, origins, characteristics and dimensions of servant leadership.

Chapter 4 covers the second phase of the literature review in relation to the theory of servant leadership. This chapter explores the application of the leadership theories described in Chapter 3 with key emphasis on servant leadership as well as their relative outcomes on organisations. It also discusses the dimension of culture in relation to leadership. In addition, it introduces the hypotheses that have been developed from the literature reviewed. The outcome of this review is the development of a theoretical framework that illustrates the association between the hypotheses.
Chapter 5 reintroduces and explores the servant leadership theory in more detail. It looks at relevant studies that have adopted the theory, discusses major findings and highlights a few limitations of the theory.

Chapter 6 is about the research methodology of the study. The adopted research philosophy and other research paradigms and approaches are explained and reviewed in relation to this study. Furthermore, the chapter explains and validates the research approaches used for data collection and analysis.

Chapter 7 presents the research findings. It analyses the quantitative and qualitative data collected using questionnaires and interviews. It begins with a descriptive analysis of the questionnaires and then the interviews in relation to the research hypotheses. This analysis is conducted through the use of the SPSS version 23 statistical tool.

Chapter 8 discusses the research findings on the practice of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. It presents a constructive evaluation of the research findings in relation to the research objectives and research hypotheses. Upon discussing the findings, a theoretical model is provided that is culture-fit and provides a better understanding of the practice of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies.

Chapter 9 represents the conclusion to the thesis. It briefly describes the major findings of the research and explains the contributions of the research to knowledge in theory and practice. Also, it presents the practical implications of the study, discusses the implications of the study, and provides recommendations for possible future research.
Chapter Two: The Socio-Economic and Political Context of Nigeria

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a synopsis of the socio-economic and political context of Nigeria. The first section explains the rationale for the researcher choosing Nigeria as the focal point of study. The next section inspects the institutional geography and economic history of Nigeria. The following sections provide social, economic and political trends that are of significance to the study of the private sector in Nigeria. It would also bring into perspective the historical events signalling the transition of leadership on a macro (national) and micro (corporate) levels. The significance of these reviews cannot be overstated because they provide a foundation for knowledge and insights that relate to this research.

2.2 Validation of Nigeria for this Study

Earlier evaluation by the World Bank (2003) noted that economic and structural transformation of the private sector is a major way Nigeria could reduce its poverty levels. Furthermore, the Nigerian private sector has a vital role in achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals for Africa (Kiplagat, 2015). This is a backdrop of the arguments by critics that even though the public sector in Nigeria is essential to its development, it has become an embodiment of corruption and mediocre practices which only reflects the extant leadership crisis (Imhonopi and Ugochukwu, 2013).

Therefore, the study of leadership in the private sector in Nigeria (the highest populated country in Africa) has become a primary source of interest in this research. The robust nature of the Nigerian private sector is such that considerable attention must be paid to its leadership challenges. In addition, prior to the commencement of this PhD research, the researcher had worked in a Nigerian American technology company and could identify the significance of leadership within private sector companies in Nigeria.
Conducting this research was very feasible and conducive as researcher was provided access to the respondents who were vital in the progress of this study.

2.3 General Background Information about Nigeria

Nigeria is located in the Western part of Africa and is estimated to have a population of 184 million people which implies that it has 47% of the West African population (World Bank, 2018). Nigeria borders the Gulf of Guinea, between Benin and Cameroon. Also, the border countries of Nigeria are Benin by 809km, Chad by 85km, Cameroon by 1,975km and Niger by 1,608km. Moreover, there was the influence of Britain on Nigeria and after a series of constitutions, it gained her independence in 1960. Post-independence, the political framework of Nigeria saw the emergence of military regimes that were successfully ousted from power consecutively until 1999 which marked a political transition to democratic leadership. Nigeria, as a federation, consists of 36 autonomous states and several ethnic groups, of which the majority are the Igbo, Hausa and Yoruba.

However, there are 371 tribes within these ethnic groups. Notably, these tribes have unique cultures which only demonstrate the multi-tribal nature of Nigeria. According to the National Planning Commission, (2004), Nigeria covers an area of 924,000 square kilometres, bordered by the Gulf of Guinea, Cameroon, Benin, Niger and Chad. The topography of Nigeria is demarcated by tropical rain forests, mangrove swamp land, and the savannah. Also, its main food crops constitute 60% of its non-oil exports. In addition, citizens in rural communities benefit from Agriculture as their major source of employment and income. The federation of Nigeria is divided into thirty-six (36) states with a Federal Capital Territory (FCT) in Abuja.
Figure 2.1: The Political Map of Nigeria

Source: https://www.ezilon.com/maps/africa/nigeria-maps.html

*Image redacted from e-thesis due to copyright restrictions*
2.4 The Socio-Cultural Context

According to Afigbo (1991), the origin of Nigeria is not defined by the varieties of economic and geographic regions or of ethnic nationalities, but in the plurality of administrative territories imposed by the British. The amalgamation of the northern and southern protectorates by Great Britain in 1914 led to the formulation of a country called Nigeria. However, they were phases that led to the amalgamation. As Eric (2016) noted that the colonial quest by Europe of Africa was influenced by the pre-World War 1 Germany’s Otto Von Bismarck’s 1884 -1885 conference in Berlin. This conference became the foundation for contemporary states in Africa including Nigeria. However, prior to colonial rule, Nigerian states were in existence. The Hausa-Fulani, Kanem Bornu, Oyo, the Igbo loosed states, and the Kingdom of Benin had already been established. The next phase led to Lagos becoming an invaded British colony in 1861 and by 1885 based on the Berlin Act, the oil protectorates of contemporary southern Nigeria were under British rule. To occupy all geographical territories of Nigeria, as at 1900, the protectorate of the Northern states was dominated by the British following the downfall of Sultan Attahiru.

Similarly, the Royal Niger Company which represented British control took over the Eastern region of Nigeria. This conquest by Great Britain led to the emergence of three distinct territories. These included the colony of Lagos, the Southern protectorate and the Northern protectorate. In 1906, Sir Walter Egerton effected the fusion of the colony of Lagos to the Southern protectorate and this effort led to the concrete foundation for the amalgamation of the Northern and Southern protectorates in 1914.

The National Planning Commission (2004) reported that Nigeria has more than 200 ethnic groups. In 2010, they confirmed that Nigeria has over 250 ethnic groups and the existence of three major tribes namely: the Hausa’s representing the North; the Igbo’s
representing the East and the Yoruba representing the West. Of these ethnic diversities, there are more than 500 indigenous dialects spoken in Nigeria.

According to Osaghae (1998); Frynas (1998); Aborisade and Mundt (2002), even though Nigeria got her independence from Britain in 1960, there has been volatility, uncertainty and high levels of instability in the political leadership. This confirmed the prior argument by Afigbo (1991) that post-independence, regional rivalry had become the basis for triggering the conflicts between economic and ethnic areas, which demands the creation of more states to accommodate the interests of various groups that feel marginalised. It is important to note that from the time Nigeria got her independence to the present time, it has witnessed a leadership transition of 15 leaders.

This is quite uncommon with other African governments like Zimbabwe and Angola that have long-term leadership. The first Prime Minister of independent Nigeria, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa held power from October 1960 to January 1966 (alongside Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe who was Nigeria’s first President serving during the same period). The second, General J.T.U Aguiyi-Ironsi ruled very briefly from January 1966 to July 1966. The third, General Yakubu Gowon was in power from 1966 to 1975. The fourth, General Murtala Mohammed ruled from 1975 to 1976. The fifth, General Olusegun Aremu Obasanjo ruled from 1976 to 1979. This gave way to the sixth, Alhaji Shehu Shagari who held office of the President from October 1979 to December 1983. The seventh, General Mohammed Buhari ruled from 1983 to 1985. The eighth, General Ibrahim Babangida ruled for eight years from August 1985 to August 1993. The ninth, Chief Ernest Shonekan was elected as the Head of an Interim Government from August 1993 to November 1993. The tenth, General Sani Abacha was the Military Head of State from 1993 to 1998. The eleventh, General Abdulsalami Abubakar ruled from 1998 to 1999. The twelfth, General Olusegun Obasanjo returned as a democratically elected President.
and ruled from 1999 to 2007. The democratic process continued which led to Alhaji Umaru Musa Yar’Adua taking over leadership as President of Nigeria from 2007 to 2010. In May 2010, Dr Goodluck Jonathan became the President of Nigeria and ruled till 29 May 2015. The current leadership of Nigeria is held by General Muhammadu Buhari who has been ruling from 2015 till date (Nigerian International Biographical Centre, 1999/2008 and The Summary, 2018). It is clearly evident that political leadership in Nigeria has witnessed very frequent changes.

However, Fagbadebo (2007) attributes these changes to the fact that most leaders in Nigeria are politically insecure and are dominated by hostile forces centred on godfatherism and uni-ethnic obligations rather than ruling the country effectively as a whole unit. Similarly, Ogundiya (2009) claimed that corruption has been the bane of legitimacy, democratic stability, socio-economic and political development in Nigeria. Furthermore, he paradoxically refers to Nigerian leaders as individuals who came in as physicians but left as patients, not being part of the solution. Interestingly, previous studies by Fubara (1982) and Ramanadham (1986) proposed that leadership failures and the absence of continuity in leadership has exceeded the macro level (national leadership) to micro level (organisational/corporate leadership) which has affected corporate strategies, policies and management practices.
The political governance of the Federal Republic of Nigeria can be best illustrated through the chart below:

**Fig 2.2: Hierarchy of Nigeria’s Political Governance (Source: Developed by the Researcher).**

Furthermore, the Nigerian government constitutes of three institutions; the executive, legislative and judiciary. The executive institution is responsible for the administration of the laws enacted by the legislature. The legislative institution is responsible for making the laws that make up the constitution of Nigeria. They are represented by the two chambers of legislature known as the Senate and the House of Representatives. The judiciary is the institution that interprets the laws of the nation. In addition, the highest judiciary body of government is the Supreme Court of Nigeria. Also, it is the function of the President to make leadership appointments to all public corporations as he/she oversees their operations. For the appointment of Ambassadors and High Commissioners to Nigeria’s foreign missions, the President nominates suitable
candidates who must be approved by the House of Senate (National Planning Commission, 2004).

2.5 The Economic Context

As oil is the major source of energy utilised in the world and a key commodity in international trade, Nigeria being one of the largest producers of oil, has petroleum as a significant aspect of its economy (Khan, 1994). Being a member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), it is estimated that Nigeria produces an average of 2.3 million barrels of oil per day and is the sixth largest producer of oil in the world (Olofin, 2007). The National Planning Commission (2004) indicated that natural gas reserves in Nigeria are estimated at 174 trillion SCF. Even though the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) is the primary regulator of the Nigerian oil and gas sector, it has business alignments with partners and joint ventures with Chevron, Total, Elf, Agip, Texaco and Mobil, just to mention a few. Despite the significance of oil to the Nigerian economy, the country also possesses a wide diversity of solid mineral resources such as deposits of gypsum, tin ore, sulphur, uranium, graphite marble, columbite, gold, tantalite, kaolin, coal and salt which are yet to be effectively commercialised as a source of income for the economy.

In addition, Nigeria is rich in agriculture as arable land constitutes 75% percent of the total land area in Nigeria, of which less than 50% has been exploited for cultivation. The consequence of this is that agriculture establishes over 45% of the annual total GDP (Gross Domestic Product), even though oil still stands as the dominant foreign exchange earner.

However, the United Nations Development Programme reported that Nigeria although rich in agriculture has not generated equitable revenue from agriculture to boost its economy. Moreover, Nigeria is a huge economy within the African continent with a GDP
growth rate of 7.23%, an external foreign reserve of $36 billion, 24 well capitalised banks, a 7.57% deposit rate, 18% prime lending rate and a 4.37% interbank rate (Akinlo, 2004). Despite the efforts to reduce Nigeria’s external debt of $35 billion (Central Bank of Nigeria, 2006). However, there has been a rapid rise in the unemployment rate in Nigeria because as at 2016, the unemployment rate was estimated at 14.2% (National Bureau of Statistics, 2016). The importance of these statistics is that they reflect the economic situation of the nation. According to Nurudeen and Usman (2010), there has been an emergent increase in government expenditure which has been caused by the huge receipts from production and the sales of crude oil.

In addition, there has been a rise in the demand for essential utilities such as roads, education, power, communication and health. Furthermore, the economy of Nigeria has had a rapid increase in capital and recurrent expenditure (known as total government expenditure) over the last four decades. The government total recurrent expenditure of Nigeria increased from N3, 819.20 in 1970 million to N36, 219.60 million in 1990. Conversely, there was a rise in government capital expenditure from N5, 004.60 million in 1977 to N24, 048.60 million in 1990 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2016).

However, the increase in government expenditure has not led to meaningful growth and development. Major evidence of Nigeria’s poor economy include; poor power supply and roads, the collapse of many resource-driven industries, high rates of inflation, high unemployment rates and inequitable national savings, just to mention a few. Regardless of the world influence of Nigeria in oil exportation, there has been a decline in its economic growth.

The GDP (Gross Domestic Product) is an indicator of the economic activity that evaluates the total value of all final goods and services that are new in production within country in a given year (O’Neill, 2014). For this reason, the GDP is an important
component of Nigeria’s economic system. According to the National Bureau of Statistics, 2018, breakdown of the sectors that contribute to Nigeria’s GDP 2018 Q2 (2\textsuperscript{nd} quarter) are as follows:

a) Agriculture, forestry and fishing: 38.46%  
b) Information and Communication: 22.93%  
c) Manufacturing: 15.62%  
d) Mining and quarrying: 14.65%  
e) Other service activities: 5.32%  
f) Education: 3.02%  

Fig 2.3 below is a chart depicting the average living standards in Nigeria from early to current leadership.

2.5.1 Summary of Economic Reforms in Nigeria

The emergence of the democratic leadership in Nigeria in 1999 under President Olusegun Obasanjo identified the need to address issues concerning political instability, inefficient democratic practices and corruption. Upon re-election of the Obasanjo regime in 2003, the administration developed an economic reform program that was dependent on indigenous strategy. This program is called NEEDS (National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies) and was operational at the federal level, while another program called SEEDS (State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies) was instituted in the 36 Nigerian states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). Furthermore, the NEEDS program stressed on the significance of the private sector as a key player in enhancing wealth production and poverty reduction in the Nigerian economy (Okonjo-Iweala and Kwaako, 2007).

Traditionally, the economic performance of Nigeria had in the past three decades had been mostly poor. For instance, the annual GDP growth over the period 1992-2002 had only averaged about 2.25 percent. The implication of this was a decline in the living standards for many Nigerians. In the same way, there were high rates of inflation as inflation levels were at an average of 28.94 percent per annum. The World Bank (2003) reported that the economy of Nigeria was heavily challenged by macroeconomic volatility which was influenced by Nigeria’s over reliance on oil export earnings and external trade shocks. Fig 2.4 below is an overview of Nigeria’s GDP growth from 2005 – anticipated 2023.
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Source: IMF: World Economic Outlook (WEO) Database, April 2018
Since the Nigerian government has incurred high levels of public sector deficits due to high external borrowing, balance of trade deficits and inflation rates, it decided to invest in privatisation to reduce public sector expenditures (Ugorji, 1995). According to Barnett and Ossowoki (2006), the macroeconomic reform would improve budgetary planning and execution and help develop a platform that promotes the diversification of the Nigerian economy and the growth of sectors that are not oil related. They suggested that Nigeria’s adoption of a suitable fiscal rule would boost intergenerational equity and smoothen public expenditure. Another main area of structural reform of the Obasanjo-led administration was privatisation. Another section within this chapter would discuss the legislation that introduced privatisation and how it was implemented.

Due to the underperforming nature of the Nigerian public sector and the high cost of running these public sector establishments, it has not yielded appropriate benefits to the nation’s economy. For example, the federal government of Nigeria spent over N74.3 billion (US$558 million) to operate the Nigerian Ports Authority just from 2002 to 2003. The federal government has consistently given investment grants and instituted financial subsidies to support public sector enterprises. Sectors as Steel Mills received investment grants and operational subsidies amounting to a total 2,751.4, in millions of naira. Similarly, oil refineries received a total of 7,597.6 while the Airports received 2,255.5. The Telecom sector received a high amount of 11,400.9 and the Mines an amount totalling 4,966.5, in millions of naira.

Between 1999 and 2006, the Nigerian government had been involved in the privatisation of some government-owned enterprises so as to reduce the financial costs of these institutions to the government. They reported that over 116 of these government-owned institutions were privatised across a diversity of industries which included energy and power, telecommunications, tourism and hospitality, petrochemical, aluminium and insurance. A typical example was the privatization of the Power Holding
Corporation of Nigeria (PHCN) which led to 18 private companies bidding for shares in the PHCN to be engaged in power generation, transmission and distribution services. Another case in point, was 51 percent of the federal government stake of the Hilton Hotel in Abuja was sold to private investors. Moreover, they argued that a remarkable impact of privatisation was prevalent in the telecommunications sector. The reason is because as at 2001, Nigeria had only 500,000 landlines but due to the liberalisation of private sector investments, there was a rapid development of the telecommunications sector as it had recorded over 32 million GSM subscribers as at 2007 (Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako, 2007).

2.5.2 The Relevance of Private Sector to Nigeria's Economic Growth

The relevance of the private sector to the Nigerian economy cannot be well described without a detailed evidence of the historical perspectives of privatisation in Nigeria. Before the Nigerian independence, the economic system involved an amalgamation of public and private ownership of enterprises to provide social and economic service to the masses. However, most of the large-scale enterprises were owned by public (government) while private enterprises were largely small and medium (Usman and Olorunmolu, 2015).

Since 1965, there has been a demand for a privatisation or commercialisation policy. The poor performance of public enterprises in Nigeria served as the rationale behind this call for privatisation. For example, between 1960 and 1965, the Nigerian Railway Corporation alone had thirteen investigations regarding its activities as in 1965 it had a deficit of N7 million and the World Bank described its finances as chaotic to the growth of the Nigerian economy (Rweyemamu and Hyden 1975).

As a result, in the early 1980s, Nigeria had witnessed unparalleled economic problems that necessitated the accrual of debts. Therefore, Nigeria requested for advice from
international agencies on how to handle the conditions provided by the IMF (International Monetary Fund) on their loan request. This loan request led to a neoliberal economic reform in 1986 introduced by the Britton Woods Institutions; World Bank and the IMF known as the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), (Danladi and Naankiel, 2016).

According to the Presidency Technical Committee on Privatisation and Commercialisation, SAP was significant in reforming the Nigerian economy and positioning it to become more effective and competitive in a globalised society. To achieve this, they argued that restructuring the public enterprises would emerge as a vital part of the Structural Adjustment Programme. However, the actual implementation of Privatisation and Commercialisation commenced in 1988 with the induction of the Technical Committee on Privatisation and Commercialisation as contained in Decree No. 25 of 1988. Consequently, in November 1989 the implementation process of full or partial commercialisation was initiated. The Privatisation and Commercialisation Act of 1988 and the Bureau of public Enterprises Act of 1993 defined privatisation as 'the relinquishment of part or all of the equity and other interests held by the Federal Government or any of its agencies in enterprises whether wholly or partly owned by the Federal Government' (Igbuzor, 2003).

The implication of this was that government-owned companies and parastatals were classified into five broad categories; Full or partial privatisation, full or partial communication or to remain as public institutions (FGN, 1988). Even though the Technical Committee on Commercialisation and Privatisation (TCPC) initially served as the secretariat and implementation of privatisation reform, there was the enactment of the Privatisation and Commercialisation Act of 1999. Following enactment of the Privatisation and Commercialisation Act of 1999, the Bureau of Public Enterprises (BPE) was established to oversee the functions of TCPC. In addition, the Act made
provision for the establishment of National Council on Privatisation (NCP). The NCP then became the lead policy making body responsible for matters involving privatisation and commercialisation in Nigeria. As a result, the Privatisation and Commercialisation Act in 1999 empowered the BPE to shift focus from commercialisation to encouraging core investors and promoting foreign investment in the privatisation programme. However, in a few cases like the Nigerian Port Authority, the BPE utilised concessioning rather than outright privatization. The process of concessioning would allow a private company to run ports for a five to ten year span. For this reason, the company is automatically given some level of ownership right.

According to Zayyad (2007), the objectives of the privatisation and commercialisation programme included:

i. To restructure and rationalise the public sector to lessen the supremacy of unproductive investments in that sector;

ii. To boost share ownership by Nigerians in productive investment before owned wholly or partially by the Government, and in the process to increase the Nigeria Capital Market;

iii. To guarantee positive returns on public sector investments in commercialised enterprises;

iv. To re-orientate the enterprises for privatisation and commercialisation towards a new horizon of performance improvement, viability and overall efficiency;

v. To inspect the present absolute dependence of commercially oriented parastatals on the Treasury for funding and to encourage their approach to the Nigerian Capital Market;
vi. To initiate the process of gradual ownership to the private sector of those public enterprises whose nature of business operations and other socio-economic factors require that they are best performed by the private sector;

vii. To ensure a favourable and conducive investment climate for both local and foreign investors; and

viii. To provide institutional arrangements and operational directions that will certify the sustainability of the gains of privatisation and commercialisation in the future.

Following this, was the privatisation of some government-owned enterprises such as the National Electric Power Authority (NEPA), Nigerian Telecommunication Limited (NITEL), the postal services, Federal Palace Hotel, African Petroleum, National oil and Unipetrol were sold to Nigerian and foreign investors. The implication of this privatisation exercise was that it released the Federal Government from paying subvention to the enterprises (Adeyemo and Salami, 2008).

The first phase of the privatisation programme between 1988-1993 had the following achievements: (1) The creation of 800,000 new shareholders. (2) The realisation of over N3.3 billion of privatisation proceeds were realized from 1,486,772,063 billion shares sold and most significant was the broadened nature of the Nigerian capital market. Consequently, the second phase of the privatisation programme started on the 20th July 1998 when the National Council on Privatisation was established with the BPE as its secretariat.

However, the privatisation of utilities such as power and telecommunications had made minimal progress in Nigeria. Here, utilities refer to large companies that main function through self-serving management and strong labour unions. As a result, opposition from both houses in the Nigerian parliament contributed to the slow progress in the Second
Phase of the privatisation programme (Mahmoud, 2003). Moreover, to enhance the effectiveness of privatisation in Nigeria, the Bureau of Public Enterprises (BPE) in December 2005 identified several enterprises to be privatised across all sectors. These included fertilizer companies, flour mills, automobile plants, machine tools company, NITEL/M-TEL, allied companies and the Nigeria Airways (Mahmoud 2003).

Boardman and Vining (2010) claimed that an effective private sector led-economy would facilitate for economic growth and development in any modern economy. However, Andabai (2014) contested this claim by stating that the Nigerian private sector is still facing challenges resulting from inconsistent governmental policies, lack of infrastructure, economic and political instability, inadequate investible funds, manpower and technological know-how.

There have been different arguments over the effects of the private sector to the Nigerian economy. Udeaja (2006) investigated the validity of the efficiency argument of privatisation by assessing the productivity performance of seven fully privatised firms in Nigeria with the use of the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). Even though the results were so mixed; a central finding was that privatisation has a positive correlation to relatively high efficiency in terms of resource usage, under both constant and variable returns to scale.

Similarly, Busari and Olayiwola (2001) argued that countries like Nigeria with high reliance on government to ensure growth with equity tend to underperform when the economy is not driven by a substantial proportion of the private sector. Moreover, Andabai (2014) argued that while Nigeria is reducing its reliance on the public sector for its economic growth and has embarked on privatisation of state-owned enterprises, there has been significant increases in economic growth due to the influx of private sector investment. As a result, he provides the following recommendations:
i. The need for governmental focus on the provision of appropriate infrastructure and provide an enabling environment for private sector investment activities to succeed;

ii. The need for the private sector-led economy to be more involved in indigenous manufacturing to preserve foreign exchange;

iii. The need for government to develop a policy framework to simplify foreign investment participation;

iv. That the government should sustain its policies and ensure that they are consistent with the nation’s advancement goals; and

v. That the government should institute micro-finance banks to provide micro-credit to low-income and medium scale investors in the agricultural sector of the economy.

These recommendations had already been taken into consideration to boost the Nigerian privatisation policy as micro-finance banks are on the rise. In addition, privatisation has helped stimulate economic growth by providing job opportunities to numerous unemployed youths. Also, privatisation has created more resources for allocation to other sectors of the economy that need urgent attention (Arowolo and Ologunowa, 2012). However, a major bane of the public sector in Nigeria was mismanagement and corruption. It is therefore very important to explore the leadership phenomenon as it relates to the private sector if it is to remain effective.
2.6 The Political Context

The history of politics in Nigeria indicates that the nation has always operated a two-party and in recent years; a multi-party system (Adejumobi, 2007); which is traceable to the rise of nationalist consciousness and political movements (Agarah, 2004). After Nigeria’s independence in 1960, key proponents of the movement of nationalism included Herbert Macaulay, Obafemi Awolowo, Samuel Akinsanya and Nnamdi Azikiwe, just to mention a few. Despite this political agitation for a united front in Nigeria, most of the political parties have based their identities on ethnic orientations rather than a national one.

For example, parties as the National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) and the Nigerian Peoples Party (NPP) had political ideologies that majorly represented the demands of the Igbo region of Nigeria. Correspondingly, the Unity Party of Nigeria (UPN), the Alliance for Democracy (AD) upheld political objectives that gratified the Yoruba region, which represented the South-Western zone of Nigeria. Also, the Hausa-Fulani of Northern Nigeria were fully represented by parties such as the National Party of Nigeria (NPN), the All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP) and the Northern Peoples Congress (NPC). Despite the spread of parties across Nigeria, the divergence in political value systems often led to inter-party conflicts and a state of political confusion for the electorate because the selected leader was meant to represent the entire nation and not a selected group. (Agarah, 2004 and Adejumobi, 2007).

A major drawback to the effect of political leadership in Nigeria has been the issue of corruption. A study by the Institute of Development Research at the Ahmadu Bello University in 2003 ranked political parties third in a list of thirty most corrupt public institutions in Nigeria (Adekeye, 2003). There are speculations that if corruption in the Nigerian politics was endemic in the 1990s, the return to democracy from military rule
has seen even more corruption (Ogbeidi, 2012). However, there are historical claims underpinning the origin of corruption in Nigeria to the colonial era. Prior to independence, there were claims of the misappropriation of public resources for personal enrichment (Storey, 1953). There is strong evidence to support the notion that since leadership class in Nigeria has been one whose focus is centred on politics that enhances materialism and self-aggrandizement.

Furthermore, Dike (2005) argued that corruption in Nigeria is demonstrated in political, bureaucratic and electoral forms through the rigging of elections and biased appointments of party loyalists. In addition, other forms of corruption are made manifest through nepotism, extortion, bribery, favouritism, fraud and embezzlements. Even though Nigeria as a subset of Africa has a cultural demand to exhibit the spirit of Ubuntu, the level of ineffective political leadership is an indicator of the absence of a strong sense of national community (Bryce, 1921).

The rise in godfatherism has been a major bane to political leadership in Nigeria as certain individuals who seen as godfathers or king makers play an effective role in the selection of certain leaders who in turn owe them material benefits. Below is an excerpt by a former governor of a state in Nigeria that conspicuously illustrates this challenge of godfatherism:

“One thing in politics is that you must believe in godfatherism. If I did not believe in it, I would not be in daddy’s place. Whether you like it or not, as a godfather you will not be a governor, you will not be a president, but you can make a governor, you can make a president. I am the greatest godfather in Nigeria because this is the first time an individual single handedly put in position every politician in the state”. (Ibrahim, 2006, p.14).
2.6.1 The Interplay between Religion and Politics in Nigeria

According to Anyia (2013), the significance of religion has become part of the daily lives of Nigerians and a key factor in their political and organisational activity. The two dominant religions in Nigeria are Christianity and Islam. Nigeria is an extremely religious country. For example, in the Southern part of Nigeria, Christianity has grown rapidly and in the Northern region of Nigeria, Islam has grown extensively to the extent that Nigeria has the highest number of pilgrims to Mecca to perform the Ummra and Hajj yearly from West Africa.

Although the Nigerian constitution specifies that ‘the government of the federation or of a state shall not adopt any religion as state religion’, religion has become a political force in Nigeria. Previous studies on religion in Nigeria suggest that 92% of Nigerians confirm that religion plays a critical part in their social and everyday lives (Marshall, 2005). Furthermore, Falola (1998) argued that religion is so vital to Nigeria that it is even been exploited by politicians to gain political leadership. The preacher in a church and the Imam in a mosque is seen as a spiritual leader whose views influence the decisions of citizens. Religion has played an integral part in Nigeria’s quest for democracy.

For example, the Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN), the Pentecostal Fellowship of Nigeria (PFN), the Catholic Bishop Conference and the Nigerian Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs were key activists of civil society in the political contest against the military (Rufai, 2011). They did this through overseeing mass protests and sensitisation of the masses to promote freedom of speech which the military stood against.
2.7 Private Sector Enterprises in Nigeria

In 1988, Nigeria formulated the Privatisation and Commercialization Decree No 25 whose primary aim was to delimit public sector ownership and control by promoting privatization and commercialisation. Before the thriving of the oil era in the 1970s, the government of Nigeria focused on good governance and the provision of essential amenities to its citizens. However, the instability of the economy necessitated the need for the government to explore the need for private investment (Adeoti, 2003). Moreover, Okafor (2007) proposed that the key objectives of the private sector industry in Nigeria were as follows:

i. To enhance a new drive of performance improvement, sustainability and overall efficiency;

ii. To boost the Nigerian capital market and lessen total dependence on the treasury for funding from governmental parastatals; and

iii. To restructure the public sector and reduce its unproductive nature

Overall, it is apparent that the private sector was driven to correct the instability caused by the ineffective administration of the public sector that has led to the nation’s economic instability. A report by the African Development Bank (2011) strongly advocated that government-led economic development could not be sustained in Nigeria, as they had become dependent on state-owned enterprises that had been unable to be innovative to keep up with the trends of global competition and their reliance on inefficient capital-intensive technologies. Therefore, the private sector is key in the transformation of the economic situation of Nigeria. Furthermore, the private sector has been gradually dominating the African economy and accounts for more than 80% of total production and two-thirds of total investment. The private sector is also diversifying its influence from agriculture to manufacturing which arguably carries a
higher multiplier effect than agriculture based on the fact that economies that are actively involved in manufacturing generate higher per capita income. (African Development Bank, 2011).

However, Adeoti (2003) pinpointed that the positive effect of the private sector on the Nigerian economy has also some social costs to it. For example, private sector enterprises would be seen as an economic threat to the public sector, but more so a social threat to the citizens of Nigeria who for decades see the public sector as an institution whose function is based on public interest. Furthermore, the influx of private sector companies through the process of privatisation could enhance private monopolies. Also, privatisation could promote economic inequalities in Nigeria by creating social polarisation of the economy. The implication of this is the widening of the gap between the ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’.

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter has provided the social-economic and political review of Nigeria. This framework would form a constructive base for understanding the elements of the research that are traceable to Nigeria’s culture, social, political and economic in relation to servant leadership and private sector companies in Nigeria.

This chapter commenced by providing a general background information about Nigeria. Understanding this background created the platform for explaining the social-cultural context of Nigeria. Here, cultural perspective of how leadership was introduced into Nigeria through pre-colonial structures were discussed. Furthermore, this chapter examined the economic context of Nigeria and provided a summary of the major economic reforms in Nigeria. Following this, was the discussion of a major element of economic reform known as “Privatisation” from a Nigerian perspective? Further discussions regarding the political context of Nigeria, the interplay between religion and
politics were presented. In identifying the relevance of the private sector in Nigeria, this chapter has provided the base for further discourse on leadership which is vital to the effectiveness of the private sector in Nigeria.

Even though this chapter has highlighted the socio-economic and political context of Nigeria, this research is limited to a population derived from private sector companies in Abuja, which represents the Northern Region of Nigeria.
Chapter Three: Servant Leadership - A Conceptual Analysis.

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a conceptual analysis of the concept of servant leadership. First, the historical backgrounds and definitions of leadership are discussed. Then, the nature of servant leadership is explored by providing an explanation of its definitions, origins, characteristics and dimensions. Identifying these components would provide a constructive framework for a better understanding of the contemporary concept of servant-leadership.

3.2 Historical Background and Definitions of Leadership

Leadership is a term that is associated with everyday life. It has been widely investigated from historical and contextual perspectives. According to Bass and Stogdill (1990), the study of history and philosophy over the centuries led to the development of principles of leadership. There have also been written philosophical evidences revealed over 5000 years ago through the Egyptian hieroglyphics that indicate that there has been a constant quest in an attempt to understand the phenomenon of leadership. In Egypt as at that time, the hieroglyphics for leadership indicated directions as to how the leader (seshemu) should interact with the follower (shemsu).

Moreover, in carrying out a study of Chinese business leaders, McDonald (2012) emphasised the foundation of leadership to Confucian teachings which had spanned over 2000 years. The Confucian views on leadership embraced harmony and loyalty (Cheung and Chan, 2005), vision and a sense of purpose (Selvarajah and Meyer, 2008) and morality (Chen and Kao, 2009). Furthermore, there are also Greek epistemological considerations to leadership. Avery (2004) made reference to Plato who characterised leaders as men of ‘gold’, and followers as men of ‘bronze.’ Likewise, Van Vugt (2006) expressed the views of Plato who stated that leadership should only be handled by a
philosopher-king. While Singh (2016), put forward the point that the knowledge of leadership in India is traceable to the 4th century BC. He confirmed his opinion by expressing the views of an Indian legend Kautilya who he argued had developed schools of thought on leadership that led to a strong economy in India (Singh, 2016).

There are not only philosophical roots to leadership, but also considerations from an anthropological perspective. Researchers such as Wilson (1975); Boyd and Richerson (2005) proposed that leadership had been in existence since when humans were organised in small hunter-gatherer societies. Despite the absence of established rule or officially elected leadership among the hunting society, there were always people who were likely to take a dominant role in the decision-making of the group. There have been a number of longitudinal studies on anthropological perspectives to leadership and followership.

For example, Lewis (1974) reported that leadership by its nature symbolises a unique and unpredictable relationship between leaders and followers. He further argued that human society would always consist of natural groups who would always be involved in the phenomena of a leader-follower interaction known as leadership within every culture. Similarly, Boehm and Boehm (1999) pointed to the fact that even in the forest; there is hierarchy which arguably reflects the foundation of an egalitarian society and the evolution of democratic politics. Although, the background of leadership has been explored thus far, it is important to note that this is not an exhaustive reflection of the foundations of leadership. However, at this point, this research would examine the leadership concept from a current perspective.

Barrow (1977) argued that leadership is one of the most broadly researched social influence processes in behavioural science because the success of economic, political and organisational systems is dependent upon the effective direction and action of
leaders. Similarly, Burns (1978) stated that the concept of leadership is one of the most observed, yet least understood phenomena on earth. This statement was made upon the premise that the growing focus of literature on leadership is a reflection of its complexity. Therefore, leadership cannot be understood from one perspective.

Moreover, according to Avery (2004), leadership is a subject of interest in complex civilisations. Likewise, Bass (2008) suggested that leadership is an investigated phenomenon in social sciences and an activity that is evident in both human and animal species. This suggestion agrees with the research previously carried out by De Waal (1996) who identified a display of leadership when studying chimpanzee behaviour in a captive colony in Arnhem Zoo, and observed that:

“a quarrel between Mama and Spin got out of hand and ended in fighting and biting. Numerous apes rushed up to the two warring females and joined in the fray. A huge knot of fighting, screaming apes rolled around in the sand, until Luit (the alpha male) leapt in literally beat them apart. He did not choose sides in the conflict, like others; instead anyone who continued to act received a blow from him”. (p. 129).

Van Vugt (2006) stated that the Handbook of Leadership by Bass and Stogdill (1990) had acknowledged no fewer than 7,500 references to original articles on leadership. This view was extended by Yammarino (2013) who stated that leadership is one of the most widely researched and discussed topics in organisational sciences.

According to the https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/leadership, the term “leadership” can simply be defined by the following interpretations; a set of characteristics that make a good leader, the position or fact of being a leader, and the person in charge of an organisation.

A number of researchers have attempted to define leadership. For example, Nash (1929), leadership can be defined as a process which involves influencing change in the conduct of people. Similarly, Stogdill (1950) stated that leadership is the process of
influencing the activities of an organised set of individuals towards goal setting and achievement. Also, in a study attempting to create a basis for measuring morale and leadership, Cattell (1951) argued that leadership represents whoever contributes to a group’s syntality resulting from its members and the relationships among them. Also, Cattell’s (1951) definition sees leadership through the viewpoint of collective efforts rather than a single individual leading the process.

Furthermore, Roach and Behling (1984) contended with Cattell’s (1951) perspective, as they see leadership as the process where an individual influences an organised group towards accomplishing goals. Dubrin (2011) stated that contemporary definitions of leadership describe leadership as the ability of an individual to inspire confidence and support among people who are needed to achieve organisational goals. Similarly, Shekari and Nikooparvar (2012) see leadership as the ability of leaders to convert purpose and vision into action. Recent research by Carter et al., (2015) stated that contemporary definitions of leadership have developed distinct perspectives of leaderships. In consequence of this, these perspectives define leadership as relational, on one hand. On another hand, leadership is defined within social contexts involving patterned emergent processes. As a result, they argue that leadership in contemporary research incorporates formal and informal influences in leader-follower interaction.

Rost (1993) observed that there are over 221 different definitions of leadership, but researchers such as Bass and Stogdill (1990); Hughes, Ginnett and Curphy (2002) and Avery (2004) argued there is no universally accepted definition of leadership. Peterson (1997) holds the view that researchers have deviated from the traditional definitions of leadership which focused on the leader as a ”great man” or “hero leader” to focus on the organisation. In consequence of this, Dubrin (2011) defines leadership as the ability of an individual to inspire confidence and support among people who are needed to
achieve organisational goals. Similarly, Shekari and Nikooparvar (2012) argued that leadership reflects the ability of leaders to convert purpose and vision into action. A more recent and comprehensive definition of leadership was provided by Antonakis and Day (2017, p. 5) who stated that,

“Leadership is a formal or informal contextually rooted and goal-influencing process that occurs between a leader and a follower, groups of followers, or institutions. The science of leadership is the systematic study of this process and its outcomes, as well as how this process depends on the leader’s traits and behaviours, observer inferences about the leader’s characteristics, and observer attributions made regarding the outcomes of the entity led”.

On the contrary, McCleskey (2014) disputed on the significance of a universal definition emphasizing that it was of no benefit to have a universal definition of leadership. Jackson, Sakuma and DeVol (2015) supports this view by stating that there are individual differences to the understanding of leadership. These differences are due to the fact that factors as perceived identities, lived experiences, ethnicity, social class and even gender identities could influence the way people define leadership. The next section examines the evolution of leadership theories which have led to the rationale behind the development of servant leadership.

3.3 The Rationale behind Servant Leadership

Over time, Leadership has been seen from different perspectives. The quest to understand the nature of leadership has brought about the emergence of new concepts and the reappraisal of old ones on leadership such as classical leadership, autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, laissez-faire leadership, spiritual leadership, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, charismatic leadership, transactional leadership, collective leadership, cross-cultural leadership, transformational leadership and servant leadership. While Grint (1997) suggested that the transition of leadership approaches from classical to contemporary and critical perspectives only echo the unending quest
for understanding how and the manner in which individuals are chosen to lead and the approach in which they lead, Daft (2014) proposed that there has been a shift in leadership perspectives in which the leader is seen as a facilitator, not a controller, a collaborator and not a competitor. This research would now define these concepts that have evolved in leadership.

3.3.1 Classical Leadership

In understanding the paradigms and cases that evolved around leadership, Avery (2004) described classical leadership as a form of leadership that promoted the dominance of an individual over a collective group of people. He further argued that practical examples of leaders in history who exemplified this leadership style included European feudal lords and US slave owners, just to mention a few. Similarly, Wheatley (2005) observed that the use of command and control methods are an example of classical leadership and claimed that there is a tendency of organisations falling back to the use of command and control.

However, Groysberg and Slind (2012), argued that the prevalence of globalisation and usage of technology is limiting the effectiveness of command and control leadership in organisations. Scholars such as Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939); Bond (2015) pointed out that the three main forms of leadership which can be classified under Classical or Traditional Leadership are namely: Autocratic; Democratic; and Laissez-faire Leadership.

3.3.1.1 Autocratic Leadership

According to De Hoogh, Greer and Den Hartog (2015), autocratic leadership can be defined as a leadership process in which decision making and is exemplified where the
power to direct is centralised to an individual dominant leader. Similarly, Bass and Bass (2009) described autocratic leadership as an approach in which the core qualities of the leader imply that all essential decisions are made by the leaders. Also, an autocratic leader’s primary concern is the accomplishment of task and not follower motivation nor job satisfaction. A distinguishing element with autocratic leadership is the prevalence of social distance between the leader and the follower. While incentives and rewards mechanism could be used in other leadership styles to drive performance, the autocratic leader utilises the enforcement of threats and punishments. Adair (2009) described autocratic leaders as bureaucrats who have a “hire and fire” mentality and assumed that employees who work under autocratic leadership are most likely to experience feelings of insecurity and fear.

In the same way, Iqbal, Anwar and Haider (2015) observed that the autocratic leadership style is depicted by an “I tell” philosophy where leaders give clear directions to followers on what to do and create no opportunity for followers’ contributions. This representation of the autocratic leader takes into account a leader who does not share his or her locus of control and decision making function.

### 3.3.1.2 Democratic Leadership

Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) suggested that democratic leadership is a leadership approach that is dependent upon group decision-making and active involvement of followers. A leadership style with a high indication of partnership between leaders and followers. However, Kariel (1956) claimed that Lewin’s ideology of democratic leadership was Machiavellian and intended to satisfy the ‘elitist’ in that it masked coercion by reflecting follower participation. Correspondingly, Grint (1997) extended this argument by suggesting that Lewin’s notion of democratic leadership could be used for undemocratic purposes and was simply used to condition attitudes of followers in a
practical sense. In attempting to define democratic leadership, Bhatti et al., (2012) described it as a leadership style which encourages followers to be involved in decision-making processes. As a result, the participation of followers informs the final decision making of the leader. Yet, the democratic leader makes the final decision. Minier (2001) illustrated on the origins of democratic leadership by reporting that between 1980s and 1990s, a democratic movement in the entire world was promoted as an opposition to dictatorial leadership and the enforcement of one man power.

As a result, Ch et al., (2017) argue that this opposition to dictatorship leadership led to the demand for the establishment of democracy in governments and in organisations. Furthermore, Amanchukwu, Stanley and Ololube (2015) explained that even though the final decision-making is dependent upon the democratic leader, he or she includes the followers in the decision-making process.

3.3.1.3 Collective Leadership

The ideology of collective leadership can be drawn from early studies undertaken in the 1920s when Mary Follett (1924) proposed that leadership evolves from dynamic interactions among organisational actors (Mainemelis, Kark and Epitropaki, 2015). Also, there has been a development of different models of collective leadership such as team leadership, network leadership, shared leadership and the complexity leadership theory. Traditional perspectives on leadership have majorly focused on the attributes brought to a team by an individual without paying much attention to the leadership that emanates within a team. Zaccaro, Rittman and Marks (2001) describe collective leadership individuals who take on whatever role function required.

This is followed by the view of O’Connor and Quinn (2004. p. 48) that “when leadership is viewed as a property of whole systems, as opposed to solely the property of
individual, effectiveness in leadership becomes more a product of those connections or relationships among the parts than the result of any one part of that system (such as the leader)”. Therefore, Morgeson, DeRue and Karam (2010) describe collective leadership as the process of team need satisfaction in the service of enhancing team effectiveness. Furthermore, the model of collective leadership demonstrates how social network approaches have led to leadership emergence and effectiveness. These elements of collective leadership are represented through patterns of interpersonal relationships among people (Wasserman and Faust, 1994). It is also argued that social networks provide the theoretical foundation for identifying and explaining leadership as a relational phenomenon (Borgatti et al., 2009).

3.3.1.4 Laissez-faire Leadership

The origin of the word Laissez-faire relates to a French phrase translated as “Let it be” and this provides the contextual background for what laissez-faire leadership style represents. Furthermore, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) describe laissez-faire leadership as a leadership of clear avoidance of responsibilities by leaders. Also, Goodnight (2011) stated that laissez-faire leadership style reflects the worst leadership style because of the absolute lack of influence from the leader. Moreover, Chaudhry and Javed (2012) provided a practical illustration of what laissez-faire leadership looks like in an organisation as one in which subordinates make the decisions for the organisation while the laissez-faire leader is conspicuously not in control.

This view was extended by Bhatti et al., (2013) who argued that the application of laissez-faire leadership in an organisation would be clearly seen through the existence of a policy of non-interference between leaders and followers. They further argued that laissez-faire leadership promotes uncontrolled freedom within the organisation as well as an unstructured pattern of attaining organisational objectives. Similarly, Hackman
and Johnson (2013) explained laissez-faire leadership as an approach that is
classified by the leader’s avoidance of interaction and conflicts with followers and
the absence of frequent feedback to followers.

3.3.2 Contemporary Leadership

Following from the above, scholars such as Yukl (2002) and Avery (2004) pointed out
that there has been a transition of classical forms of leadership to more contemporary
forms which have transactional, visionary, transformational and organic perspectives.
They are as discussed below:

3.3.2.1 Charismatic Leadership

Early research on charismatic leadership has been attributed to Max Weber who
asserted that charismatic leaders are individuals who “…. reveal a transcendent mission
or course of action which may be in itself appealing to the potential followers, but which
is acted on because the followers believe their leader is extra-ordinarily gifted” (Dow,
1969, p. 308). Similarly, House (1976) traced the origin of charismatic leadership by
connoting that the term charisma represents leaders who use their personal abilities to
derive loyalty and devotion from followers who see them as inspiring. Since then, recent
developments on charismatic leadership have emerged.

For example, Conger and Kanungo (1998); Oreg and Berson (2015) have described
charismatic leadership as the process in which leaders stimulate followers by
expressing their resilient convictions, positive emotions and creative vision. Other views
tend to look at charismatic leadership from an emotional perspective. According to Erez
et al., (2008), charismatic leadership is characterised by the charismatic leaders
consistent use of self-excitement and enthusiasm to appeal to followers’ emotions. This
view was supported by Gebert, Heinitz and Buengeler (2016) who observed that
because the charismatic leader is perceived to be a role model, there is a tendency for followers to adopt the leader’s vision, mission and innate values into their self-concepts.

### 3.3.2.2 Transactional Leadership

Lowe, Kroeck and Sivasubramaniam (1996) pointed out that the origin of transactional leadership can be traced to Burns (1978) who after examining the literature on leadership styles and traits, especially on leader-member exchange, developed the concept of transactional leadership. Burns (1978) defined transactional leadership as a leadership approach in which the leader initiates contact with subordinates for the purpose of exchanging something of value which could include mutual support, certain rewards for performance and shared disclosure.

Furthermore, Burns (1978) and Emery and Barker (2007) described transactional leadership as a leadership style which comprehensively relies upon emphasis on tasks, assignments and standards to achieve certain objectives. However, Yukl (2002) observed that even though transactional leadership may possibly involve values, these values must be applicable to the exchange process.

Therefore, transactional leadership is a leadership approach that motivates followers by appealing to their self-interests. The nature of transactional leadership was further appraised by Avery (2004) who differentiated transactional leadership from classical leadership with the argument that the transactional leader views followers as individuals, unlike the classical leader whose outlook of the follower is as a tool for exercising command and control.

In addition, Breevart et al., (2014) defined transactional leadership as an exchange form of interaction which satisfies the leader’s expectations and still inspires employees’ engagement by meeting those components such as contingency rewards in order to
drive their efficiency levels. Prior research by Bass (1998) described contingent rewards as a transactional leadership behaviour in which leaders clarify role and task requirements and provide followers with material or psychological rewards contingent upon achieving certain contractual obligations.

In similar terms, Zeb et al., (2015) pointed out that transactional leadership is a leadership approach that is contingent based upon reward based performance and management by expectation. Correspondingly, Shah and Hamid (2015) stated that two key behaviours of the transactional leadership style are contingent reward and management by exception.

**3.3.2.3 Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)**

This leadership approach is also known as the leader exchange. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) argued that there was a growing interest in the investigation of elements of the Leader-Member Exchange style in organisations. This view was supported by Tordera and Gonzalez-Roma (2013) who stated that many studies have investigated the LMX style to understand the effects of leadership on organisational behaviour. According to Bauer and Erdogan (2015), LMX is a leadership style which observes the dual association between leaders and members (followers) as important in understanding the effects of the leader on members, teams, and organizations. They also suggest that under the LMX approach, leaders form high-quality exchanges with their direct teams which would promote trust, care and mutual respect.

However, leaders form low-quality exchanges with teams that are indirectly related to them. The term ‘exchange’ here refers to levels of relationships. Similarly, Luo et al., (2016) described leader-member exchange (LMX) as a relationship-based leadership approach which represents the quality of exchange relationships that exist between
employees and their superiors. In addition, they refer to the LMX approach as one that promotes high levels of interactions between leaders and followers.

### 3.3.2.4 Transformational Leadership

Early research on transformational leadership is attributed to Burns (1978) who contended that for leadership to be effectively explored, it must be in alignment with a collective purpose and an appraisal of effective leaders should be dependent upon their ability to make social changes. Unlike the transactional leadership which focuses on exchange relations between the leader and the follower, transformational leadership postulates that the leader is seeking for potential motives in followers so as to satisfy their higher needs and develop the full person of the follower. He suggests that transformational leadership reflects an approach with an outcome in which followers become leaders and leaders become moral agents.

Burns (1978) described transformational leadership as a leadership that expresses high value on morality. He attributed the basis for developing transformational as an elixir to misunderstanding of the role of power in relation to leadership, which he argued tends to undermine the importance of relationships.

As a follow up to the research by Burns, Bass (1998) carried out an extensive research on transformational leadership. After observing how educational, business and military organisations functioned, he described transformational leadership as a very effective leadership style in motivating followers and increasing their levels of commitment. He formulated four characteristics of a transformational leadership as follows:

1. **Idealised Influence** - This indicates that the transformational leaders are role models because they are respected and admired by followers who like to become like them. At the same time, these leaders demonstrate a clear sense of vision, a strong purpose and are risk takers.
ii. Inspirational Motivation: This signifies that the activities of transformational leaders motivate, challenge and make their followers more zealous towards their tasks.

iii. Intellectual Stimulation: This represents the consistent practise of the transformational leaders in developing new ideas and perspectives that would instil a sense of creativity on followers.

iv. Individualized Consideration: This relies on the premise that transformational leaders are concerned about developing the potential of their followers and establish a work culture that supports followers to meet organisational objectives.

According to Yukl (2002), transformational leadership is a leadership style that attends to the moral values of followers in an attempt to raise their consciousness about ethical issues and assemble their drive to reform organisations. He takes into account the significance of authenticity in leadership.

3.3.2.5 Ethical Leadership

According to Brown and Trevino (2006), ethical leadership is a contemporary leadership ideology that responds to recent challenges that organisations face regarding ethics. For example, scandals involving Enron, World Com and other organisations in business, non-profits, government and even religious organisations have compelled people’s interest in seeking the kind of leadership that addresses the significance of ethics in leadership. Brown, Trevino and Harrison (2005) described ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement and decision-making”. For this reason, Brown and Trevino (2006) argue that organisations today are in high demand of the kind of
leadership that are considerate, fair and promote moral values. They describe ethical leadership as:

“The demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement and decision-making” (p. 120).

In addition, Brown and Trevino (2006), maintain that ethical leaders interact with followers in ways that depict honesty, fairness and care which gives the leader credibility for the leadership role. In addition, Paharia and Singh (2016) describe the ethical leader as a leader who is first a moral individual and then a moral leader. Moral individuals in the sense that their personal conduct is dictated by moral principles. Moral leadership is based on the premise that decision-making is taken within ethical considerations that benefits the followers and the organisation. Moreover, Ciulla (2014) suggested that ethical values form the core of ethical leadership and identified its connection to transactional and transformational leadership styles.

The attributes of an ethical leader include trustworthiness, honesty, being approachable, showing care and fairness in decision making (Brown and Trevino, 2006; Zhu et al., 2015). Therefore, they point out that ethical leaders exemplify themselves as ethical role models for their subordinates and establish ethical standards in their organisations framework.

3.3.2.6 Spiritual Leadership

Fry (2003) pointed out that a leadership type which is now been closely associated to the workplace is Spiritual Leadership. He further explained that spiritual leadership is a leadership principle which is established through a model of motivation that is innate to the leader and expressed through the use of vision, faith, altruistic love and spiritual
survival in order to achieve organisational outcomes. However, in relation to the spiritual leadership theory, Kriger and Seng (2005) reflected on the term “spirituality” as the quest for self-transcendence and the associated feeling of interconnectedness with all things in the universe. Fry et al., (2017) argued that even though spirituality is manifested in groups and organisations. It is commonly seen as inherently personal. They base their argument upon the standpoint that evolution of religion as an institution would always centre on spiritual experiences of individuals.

Reave (2005) argued that a key element of workplace spirituality is an inner life that it nourishes and is nourished by transcendence of the self within the context of a community based on the values of altruistic love. Because of this, Fry and Nisiewicz (2013) advanced by explaining the term “altruistic love” in the definition of spiritual leadership as an impression of friendship, peace and security created through care, concern and recognition that exist between leaders and followers.

However, Krishnakumar et al., (2015) observed that there are gaps in the understanding of spiritual leadership because a lot of research over the past two decades has not clearly investigated the situational characteristics of the leader. They further argue that little focus has been given to factors as the leader’s and follower’s feelings of interconnectedness, religious or existential faith as well as the charisma of the leader, which define spiritual leadership better.

3.3.2.7 Authentic Leadership
Shamir and Eilam (2005) defined authentic leadership by investigating what makes up an authentic leader. They described the authentic leader in the following dimensions:

i. **Genuineness**: The authentic leader is portrayed to be a leader who is sincere in his/her leadership capabilities and actions. A leader who is transparent about his/her abilities and limitations and as such does not create a false personality in order to fit into the leadership position. For this reason, the authentic leader expresses his/her real self without seeking to conform to follower's expectations.

ii. **Conviction**: The authentic leader is symbolised as a leader who leads based on conviction rather than the quest for recognition. The authentic leader is described as a leader whose main focus is to achieve organisational objectives and is a conviction-driven leader.

iii. **Originality**: The authentic leader’s consistent use of convictions enables a display of originality in decision making. In addition, they place high emphasis on personal experiences which tend to dictate their value system. Furthermore, authentic leaders are portrayed as leaders who have personal perspectives and are clear about their convictions and values.

However, Luthans et al., (2006) argued that the term 'authentic leadership' is a foundation that serves as a point of departure for other types of leadership such as transactional and transformational leadership. They further suggested that a transactional or transformational leader tends to be authentic, and the authentic leader should not be a particular type of leader in a practical sense.

It can be seen from above that conceptual analysis of the literature on classical and contemporary definitions of leadership have paid attention to leadership by describing the leader from divergent perspectives. However, another significant contemporary
concept of leadership is one which identifies the follower as the leader and the leader as a servant first, known as servant leadership. It is also upon this concept of servant leadership, that this research is based.

The concept of servant leadership was postulated by Greenleaf in 1970, and has since generated a lot interest among researchers of leadership not only because of the name “Servant” and the ideology behind it, but also because it represents a twist of the leadership paradigm, and therefore genuinely places the interest of the followers as the principal concern of the leader.

3.4 Servant Leadership

The origin of the term “Servant Leadership” is accredited to Greenleaf who in 1970 published an essay called, “The servant as leader”, after his review of a novel, ‘Journey to the East’ by Herman Hesse in 1960. According to Spears (1996), the interpretation of Greenleaf’s understanding of the novel led to the formulation of an ideology that a great leader must firstly become a servant and get the experience as the servant, which is central to his/her greatness. Moreover, Spears (1996) described Journey to the East as a novel that depicted a collection of travellers on a mission to achieve spiritual needs. On their voyage, these travellers had a servant by the name of Leo who supported them through acts of service and provided direction when needed in the course of the journey.

However, at some point in the journey, Leo goes missing and his importance is only most realised at that point, for the sojourners needed him to complete their journey. He was needed because of his awareness of their final destination. After years of searching, the narrator comes in contact with Leo who takes him into the religious order (the essence of their quest). Eventually, the narrator is shocked to realise that the servant Leo is actually the Head of the spiritual order, its guiding spirit and a gallant
leader. According to Dwyer (2016), Greenleaf’s idea of servant leadership have ignited the scope of leadership researchers to view leadership not only from the standpoint of the individual who leads but also from the follower who is empowered by the servant leader.

3.4.1 Validation of Origin

There are different perspectives on the origin of servant leadership that goes beyond the novel Journey to the East. In focusing on the origin of servant leadership, Rarick and Nickerson (2009) established the claim that the origin of Servant Leadership be traced to India as seen in the Gita tradition which exemplified leadership practices in where the leader was not self-centred but had tremendous individual concern for the followers. This suggestion supports the views of Trompenaars and Voerman (2009) who also traced the origins of servant leadership to the creeds of the Bhagavad Gita which suggests the presence of the Creator in every act of service. They further extended their position to Christianity by examining the life of Jesus Christ who stated that “He came to serve, not to be served”. Also, references were made to the excerpts of the Sufi Sheik Bawa Muhaiyaddeen who indicated that “To realise the pain and suffering of others, and to offer your hands in assistance in order to alleviate their suffering, is Islam.” Beyond these religious endorsements, there are philosophical anecdotes to the origin of Servant Leadership.

According to Patterson (2003), Servant Leadership could be traced to Aristotle’s philosophy which emphasized the importance of servitude for healthy existence among society. In addition, he argued that Aristotle’s concept of virtue as the process of individuals doing right things through moral character could relate as a valid descriptor of servant leadership. However, Hauptli (2002) had previously argued that Aristotle’s principles had attracted criticism for gender bias, and should be not associated with
servant leadership because Servant Leadership does not have inequality as a virtue. Similarly, Whetstone (2005) suggested that the Aristotelian concept of leadership had unethical doctrines such as social disparity which in his opinion does not give room for any moral form of leadership. He pointed out that the presence of inequality in any social system reflects a decline in the moral fabric of what leadership should represent. However, according to Trompenaars and Voerman (2009), Plato’s theory of moral ethics which suggested that leaders had an active sense of duty to meet the needs of larger society had a significant relationship to servant leadership. They argued that Plato’s philosophical perspective on virtues for good life such as courage, righteousness, moderation and wisdom through moral and ethical leadership had a correlation to characteristics of servant leadership. After reviewing the origin of servant leadership and its validation through previous studies, it is now necessary to explain what Servant Leadership is.

### 3.4.2 Definitions of Servant Leadership

According to the Oxford English Dictionary (2016), the term “Servant” can be defined from three (3) dimensions:

i. a person who performs duties for others, especially one employed on domestic duties: e.g., a personal attendant;

ii. a person employed in the service of government who is normally referred to as a public or civil servant; and

iii. a devoted and helpful follower or supporter.

Several authors have attempted to define servant leadership after Greenleaf’s (1977) famous definition of servant leadership as follows:

> “The Servant-Leader is servant first….It begins with a natural feeling that one wants to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to
Greenleaf (1977) further proposed that Servant Leadership is a leadership process in which there is a genuine concern of the leader towards the follower. This concern therefore, brings about serving and leading the followers at the same time. In Greenleaf’s (1977) investigation of the nature of legitimate power and greatness, he pointed out that Servant Leadership should be observed beyond its application as a management technique but also a way of life which commences with “the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first” (pp. 13-14).

In the same way, in viewing servant leadership as a way of life, Graham (1991) argued that servant leadership involves serving multiple stakeholders which included society. While expanding the scope of beneficiaries to servant leadership practice, he emphasised that the way of life of the servant leader is to ensure that the followers’ highest priority needs are met. However, further perspectives on what servant leadership is have emerged in recent years.

According to Spears (1996), Servant Leadership can be defined as a new leadership model that places serving others as dominant priority. This view is supported by Patterson (2003) who argued that Servant Leadership is an emergent leadership style that has high emphasis on service to followers, a holistic approach to work and one that upholds a sense of alliance and participation in decision-making processes.

Similarly, Luthans and Avolio (2003) described the leader who practices servant leadership as a servant-leader and defined servant leadership as the practise in which the servant-leader builds opportunities for followers to develop within the organisation. They go further to argue that the servant-leader is one who leads not because of the
need for power but the need to serve. Moreover, Woodruff (2004), defined Servant Leadership as an approach of leading others by placing organisational purpose, organisational needs and people needs over the needs and desires of the leader. Also, Walumbwa, Hartnell and Oke (2010) stated that Servant Leadership is a leadership approach in which the activities of the servant-leader would encourage the commitment of employees to the organisation.

There are viewpoints that tend to define servant leadership based on its nature and characteristics. For example, DePree (1989) speculates on the definition of servant leadership by looking at its nature. Although he views the nature of servant leadership as serving not leading, he also suggests that the act of serving others is the way in which leaders can lead followers to the point of self-actualisation.

In the same way, Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) described servant leadership by laying emphasis on what characterises its application in the workplace by looking at variables such as follower-centricity, altruistic, moral/ethical and even spiritual values. In addition, Whetstone (2002) explained servant leadership by emphasizing on the commitment of the servant-leader towards treating followers respectfully and with utmost concern. Likewise, Mehta and Pillay (2011) highlight the nature of servant leadership as contradictory based on their premise that to a layman, a leader symbolises power while a servant does not. Therefore, they argued that the terminology itself could be misleading.

However, Hernandez et al, (2011) argued that there is no universally accepted definition of servant leadership and can be discussed from various dimensions. This view was supported by Page and Don (2015) who argue that the complexity of the servant leadership concept has led to no universal definition. They suggest that servant leadership can only be defined from a multi-dimensional perspective with an extensive
range of meanings. Therefore, the next section is to consider the characteristics and dimensions of servant leadership.

### 3.4.3 Servant Leadership Dimensions and Characteristics

Russell and Stone (2002) argued that if servant leadership is different from other approaches to leadership, it would be important to identify the characteristics that distinguish the servant leader from other leaders. Similarly, Van Dierendonck (2011) suggested that since Spears, was the former director of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership and a close associate to Greenleaf, he was highly suitable to interpret Greenleaf’s ideas of what characterises the Servant Leader. To support this observation, it would be appropriate to look at the characteristics of servant leadership by Spears (1995) so as to evaluate the interpretations made by other scholars. Spears (1995) extended the work of Greenleaf by suggesting 10 characteristics of a servant leader. They are:

**Listening:** Greenleaf (1977) argued that the first response of a genuine servant leader is to listen to the followers. This view was extended by Spears (1995) who defined listening as the active approval of followers’ views, recommendations and ideas which enable the servant leader to reflect more effectively. Similarly, Bass and Avolio (1995) argued that followers have an intrinsic yearning to be heard and that the practice of listening exemplified by the servant leader would allow followers to become freer, wiser and more independent.

Moreover, in support of the need for listening in effective servant leadership, Bechler and Johnson (1998); Barbuto and Wheeler, (2006) observed that there is a positive relationship between listening skills and effectiveness in servant leadership. Also, Fracaro (2001) stated that listening is one of the most significant components in the interactive process between leaders and followers, and that the practice of listening is
more effective than speaking in the process of servant leadership. It is also argued that listening enhances open communication and could lead to employee’s increased motivation, high trust, more care, lower absenteeism and the reduction of vices within the organisation (Stone, Russell and Patterson, 2004; Flynn, Smither and Walker, 2008). Furthermore, more recent studies by (Sipe and Frick, 2015; Le Ng, Choi and Soehod, 2016; Flynn, Smither and Walker, 2016) have provided empirical evidence of the importance of listening in servant leadership.

For example, a study by Le Ng, Choi and Soehod, (2016) investigated the relationship between servant leadership and employees’ job withdrawal intention and found that certain characteristics of servant leadership, especially listening, could reduce employees’ withdrawal intention. They argued that employees felt valued when they were listened to and felt free to share their concerns with their leaders. Therefore, it can be confirmed that listening is a key characteristic of servant leadership.

**Empathy:** Spears (1995) views empathy as a characteristic which servant leaders utilise to understand and empathise with followers. According to George (2000) and Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), empathy is the ability of a leader to align with a follower’s situation in order to comprehend their position and perspective. It is also seen as a behaviour that stresses the importance of listening to followers and being thoughtful of their emotions and necessities (Kayworth and Leidner, 2002; Mittal and Dorfman, 2012), and as a skill of understanding others’ emotional state and difficulties more effectively (Voss et al., 2010). In this respect, many studies of servant leadership have concluded that empathy is a key characteristic of leadership.

For example, a study by Butler and Chinowsky (2006) found that empathy was a significant emotional intelligence behaviour for effective leadership within organisations. Another study by Snyder, Lopez and Pedrotti (2010) found empathy to reflect an
individual’s emotional response to the perceived plights of another. Correspondingly, Holt and Marquez (2012) defined empathy as the skill of understanding others’ emotional state and difficulties more effectively. He further identified this behavioural trait as a skill exemplified by servant leaders. An earlier study by Kayworth and Leidner (2002) reported that it is vital for organisational leaders in competitive business environments to have empathy skills because they will allow such leaders interact effectively with team members in order to achieve organisational goals. Similarly, Voss, Gruber and Reppel (2010) posited that the application of empathy skills would enable corporate leaders to understand subordinates’ viewpoints more effectively and thus make the workplace more inspiring and result-oriented.

Also, Van Dierendonck (2011) identified empathy as critical for leaders who intend to practice servant leadership. Holt and Marquez (2012) in an empirical study found that empathy received the lowest rating when compared to other leadership characteristics because they argued, young people are less capable to reveal empathy-based emotions than mature people. Recently, Humphrey and Adams (2016) stated that empathy is a key attribute to effective leadership because it creates a stronger bond between leaders and followers. They also argued that leaders who display empathy are more likely to build leader trust, organisational trust, team spirit and an increased motivation towards work from their followers. Moreover, having investigated the impact of empathy on leadership effectiveness in the United States and Malaysia, Rahman and Castelli (2016) found that increased levels of empathy skills were fundamental to attaining leadership effectiveness. Therefore, it can be concluded that empathy is a key characteristic of servant leadership.
Also, having investigated the impact of empathy on leadership effectiveness in United States and Malaysia, Rahman and Castelli (2016) put forward the point that increased levels of empathy skills are fundamental to attain the servant leader’s effectiveness.

**Emotional Healing**: Since Spears (1995) introduced the characteristic of emotional healing which he explained to be the process where the servant leader consistently heals personal and follower emotions, further suggestions have emerged. For example, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), described emotional healing to signify a leader’s ability and zeal to encourage followers’ recovery from difficulties. Liden et al., (2008) defined emotional healing as the act of expressing sensitivity to the concerns of others. This element of emotional healing was revisited when Spears (2010) described emotional healing as an active tool for workplace integration and transformation. He stressed this notion based on his assumption that people in the workplace tend to become victims of emotional challenges and the need for healing should not be ignored.

Moreover, Dennis, Kinzler-Norheim and Bocarnea (2010) argued that a great strength of servant leadership is the ability of a servant leader to heal self and followers. They explained that although the visibility of emotional sufferings is part of human nature, servant leaders would always embrace avenues where they can heal followers in order to make them more effective on their job functions. They also argued that their assumption supports the earlier view of Greenleaf (1970, p. 24) that: “There is something that subtle communicated to one who is being served and led if, implicit in the compact between servant-leader and led, is the understanding that the search for wholeness is something they share”.

Furthermore, McCann, Grave and Cox (2014) found that within organisations, there would always be the need for followers and even leaders to recover from personal hardships or trauma. They stated that the servant leader’s use of effective listening and
empathy facilitates the healing process and enhances the relationship between the servant leader and the follower. Therefore it can be confirmed that emotional healing as a characteristic demonstrated by servant leaders improves the servant leaders’ ability to listen, show empathy and build relationships with followers.

**Persuasion:** Spears (2004) described persuasion as a characteristic that the servant leader depends upon in decision-making, rather than exerting the use of authority. He argued that the servant leader seeks to convince and obtain commitment from followers rather than force compliance. Similarly, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) pointed out that persuasion denotes the ability of a leader to influence followers through methods that may not relate to the use of formal authority.

According to Liden et al., (2008) and Sun (2013), the characteristic of persuasion is comparable to visioning because it reflects the degree to which a servant leader deploys sound reasoning to identify and solve issues in order to visualise better possibilities for the future. Likewise, Beck (2014) argued that servant leaders must have the capability to encourage followers towards accomplishing greater possibilities. He suggested that this would only be possible through the influence that originates from persuasion.

Moreover, in an investigation of the impact of servant leadership on employee empowerment, Gupta (2015) argued that persuasion by the servant leader had positive impact on employee engagement and job satisfaction which could influence an organisation to achieve its objectives. This view is supported by Tischler et al., (2015) who suggested that persuasion is one of the components that influences an employee’s self- efficacy which in turn could bring about job satisfaction. Therefore it can be concluded that permission is a characteristic servant leaders employ in increasing job satisfaction and empower followers in decision making.
**Awareness:** According to Spears (1995), awareness is the ability of servant leaders to be conscious of self and general activities around them. He further argued that awareness would strengthen the leader’s interaction with followers in an ethical manner. Similarly, Jackson and Morgan (2007) stated that awareness involves the capacity of a leader to read and interpret signals within working environment. He explained that the practice of awareness would help develop a sense of trust from employees within the organisation.

Van Dierendonck (2011) sees awareness as the act of servant leaders being awake to the realities before them. Although this view is supported by Pavlovich and Corner (2015), they extend further by categorising the awareness of a servant leader into two types:

i. **Self-awareness:** This connotes a sense that the servant leader is conscious of self as an individual entity within the environment, and is still mindful of their interrelationship with the environment.

ii. **External-awareness:** This extends the view of self-awareness and indicates that the servant leader’s conscious awareness of self now equips them with the ability to connect their awareness with those of followers.

Furthermore, Staats (2016) pointed out that awareness is a critical component that makes the servant leader easily adapt to the followers and the workplace environment. This view is supported by Sousa and Van Dierendonck (2017) who found awareness to be a significant element in balancing the relationship between humble service and action that symbolises servant leadership. Therefore, many studies have confirmed that awareness is a key characteristic of servant leadership.
Foresight: Spears (1995) described foresight as the catalyst which allows servant leaders to benefit from past experiences to adapt to present realities. He argued that foresight was imbedded in the intuitive minds of servant leaders. Barbuto and Wheeler (2002) stated that the use of foresight by servant leaders is to prepare for the future of the followers. In a study investigating perceptions of leadership and the level of trust between employees and supervisors, Reinke (2004), explained a strong relationship between foresight and conceptualization. She argued that it is impossible to conceive of a situation where a servant leader builds a vision (conceptualise) without the ability to place situations within their context and anticipate future possibilities (foresight). Also, in studying the role of servant leadership in the Bedouin Arab culture, Sarayrah (2004) asserted that foresight helped the servant leaders to understand the lessons of the past, the realities of the present and the likely consequences of the future. Therefore, it can be stated that foresight is an important characteristic of servant leadership.

Conceptualization: Spears (1995) viewed conceptualisation as the ability of the servant leader to “dream great dreams”, and think beyond the status quo for effective leadership. This view is supported by Towler (2003) who pointed out that the ability of a servant leader to visualise and conceptualise would stimulate leadership performance. Moreover, a few studies of servant leadership have provided empirical evidence on the significance of conceptualisation in leadership.

For example, a study by Hay and Hodgkinson (2006) found that it was vital for leaders within the teaching profession to consistently conceptualise. They concluded that conceptualisation would make the leaders more effective in decision-making and promote followers’ trust. Moreover, Van Eeden, Cilliers and Van Deventer (2008) reported that a leader’s ability to conceptualise leads to positive short-term changes and
long-term growth that would transform the organisation. Therefore, it can be confirmed that conceptualisation is an essential characteristic of servant leadership.

**Stewardship:** Spears (1995, p.6) defined stewardship as “holding something in trust for another”. He argued that servant leaders have a characteristic of stewardship in that their primary commitment is to serve the followers. Also, Van Dierendonck (2011) described stewardship as the process of keeping something in trust for others in order to meet their needs. He stated that stewardship is a characteristic of servant leadership that influences the leaders’ zeal to contribute to society. Moreover, Barbuto, Gottfredson and Searle (2014) pointed out that stewardship represents a leader’s desire to construct a positive legacy by taking responsibility for the wellbeing of the followers. A study by Peterson, Galvin and Lange (2012) investigated the characteristics and performance of firms with CEOs who practice servant leadership and reported that a common servant leadership characteristic the CEOs exemplified was stewardship, which they argued, had helped to develop mutual bonds within their organisations. Similarly, in a study of servant leadership in the Chinese public sector, Liu, Hu and Cheng (2015) found that the display of stewardship by servant leaders encouraged followers to do the same. Therefore, it can be asserted that stewardship is a key characteristic of servant leadership.

**Growth:** Spears (1995) asserted that servant leaders are committed to the growth of their followers because they see their followers as having an intrinsic value. He argued that a great outcome of the practice of servant leadership is the development of followers in a positive way, which he identified as growth. Also, Hale and Fields (2007) identified servant leadership as a leadership approach that is so concerned about the growth of followers to the extent that the leaders place the welfare of their followers before that of themselves.
In this respect, Cerit (2009) stated that growth is an action process in which the servant leader provides opportunities for subordinates to learn and develop personally and professionally. Also, Trastek, Hamilton and Niles (2014) in a study of servant leadership in the health sector in the USA found that the servant leaders’ concern for the growth of followers had been positively related to the followers’ trust and a high level of employee performance. Therefore, it can be concluded that growth is an essential characteristic of servant leadership.

**Community Building:** According to Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), community building signifies the leader’s capacity to encourage a sense of community spirit within the organisation. They further argued that community building would enhance employer commitment and organizational identity due to the high levels of interpersonal relationships that it generates. Liden et al., (2008) observed that community building is one factor which differentiates the servant leader from other types of leaders. According to Spears (2010), servant leaders have a sense of duty to build community among those who work within the organisation, yet also the larger society. Spears (2010) cited the views of Greenleaf (1991) who stated:

“All that is needed to rebuild community as a viable form for large numbers of people is for enough servant-leaders to show the way, not by mass movements, but by each servant-leader demonstrating his own unlimited liability for a specific community-related group” (p.30).

It should be noted that Spears (1998) pointed out that the characteristics of servant leadership that he identified earlier in 1995, were not all-inclusive and he called for the need for further research. For this reason, Russell and Stone (2002) expanded upon these characteristics by identifying twenty attributes of servant leaders as described in the next section.
3.5 Attributes of Servant Leadership

It should be noted that Spears (1998) described servant leadership in terms of “characteristics”, while Russell and Stone (2002) used the term “attributes”. In fact, Russell and Stone (2002), proposed an extension of Spear's (1998) ten (10) characteristics to twenty (20) attributes. This was undertaken because after their review of existing literature related to servant leadership, they identified the need to create a researchable model of the servant leadership theory by expanding and categorising these attributes which would develop a more comprehensive understanding of the servant leadership theory and provide measures through which the theory could be tested in application. The twenty attributes are categorised as functional and accompanying attributes.

3.5.1 Functional Attributes

Functional attributes are vision, honesty and integrity, service, trust, pioneering, appreciation of others and empowerment.

1. Vision: Russell and Stone (2002) explained that Greenleaf (1977, pp.21) used the terms foresight and conceptualization to describe the vision. They put forward the point of Greenleaf that the servant leader “needs to have a sense for the unknowable and be able to foresee the unforeseeable”. According to Longstaffe (2005), vision from the perspective of a servant leader symbolises the ability of a leader to envision and generate new ideas. Similarly, Soumya and Bagali (2013) described vision as the process in which the servant leader develops, transforms and implements an image of a desired future.

Moreover, Chaston (2013) argued that servant leaders do not only exemplify their vision but also demand cooperation from followers to achieve their vision. However, Mitchell (2015) suggested that servant leaders do not only have vision but have a compelling vision; the kind of vision that inspires employees’ towards attaining changes that are not
mediocre. Recently, Wihler (2016) suggested that the ability of a servant leader to create a vision is the primary step in influencing change among employees.

2. **Honesty and Integrity**: Russell and Stone (2002) maintained that these two attributes simply represent the genuineness of a leader’s character. They claim that honesty and integrity can be used interchangeably as they both mean the same thing. They are both the determining factors that would influence followers’ confidence. The absence of these attributes could lead to the followers’ lack of trust for the leader and the organisation. Furthermore, Ogunforuwa and Bourdage (2014) suggested that a leader with a high level of honesty is likely to promote high ethical practices within the organisation. This view is supported by Engelbrecht, Heine and Mahembe (2015) who found that there was a positive relationship between integrity, ethical practice and leader trust. Likewise, Schwepker and Johnston (2016) argue that servant leaders who demonstrate honesty and integrity have the tendency to make objective decisions.

3. **Service**: Greenleaf (1977) connotes the term “servant leadership” to reflect a leader who has the desire for service first; to serve others. Therefore, service is the fundamental base of servant leadership. Russell and Stone (2002) identified practical examples of how servant leaders demonstrate the attribute of service. They did this by citing Fairholm (1998, p. 140) who stated that “They serve by making available to followers information, time, attention, material and other resources and the higher corporate purposes that give meaning to the work”. Yoshida et al., (2014) suggested that the desire for the servant leader to serve is the reason why his or her personal goals become subsidiary to the goals of his followers. He further proposed that there may be hardly any conflict between self-interest and service because the quest to serve is the reason why a servant leader assumes leadership.
4. **Trust**: According to Russell and Stone (2002), trust could be described as the root of all great leadership. In investigating the attribute of trust from a leadership position, Den Hartog and Belschak (2012) claimed that trust could be evidently seen in the practise of servant, transformational and ethical forms of leadership. To add to this viewpoint, Engelbrecht, Heine and Mahembe (2015) posited that trust is determined by the extent to which employees perceive a leader’s level of execution of his/her responsibilities as leader.

5. **Pioneering**: According to Bennis (1997, p.95), “leadership is all about innovating and initiating”. Russell and Stone (2002) identify servant leaders as pioneers, and individuals who begin a cause for positive organisational change. This notion corroborates with the view of Neuschel (2005) who argued that servant leaders are innovative and risk taking individuals who consistently demonstrate their ability to champion the demands for positive change within an organisation.

6. **Appreciation of Others**: Russell and Stone (2002) suggested that a significant method of empowering followers is by recognition of their human and organisational value. This corresponds with Autry (2007) who said that a key attribute of a servant leader is his or her ability to visibly appreciate value, encourage and express concern for followers. Furthermore, according to Walter et al., (2013), appreciation or recognition of employees is a leadership attribute that is closely linked to the emotional aspect of employees. They further explained that recognition from leaders could assist leaders in coordinating the team effectively. Although, Peterson, Galvin and Lange (2012) point out that employee appreciation within an organisational culture may decrease turnover, improve employee engagement and satisfaction, he also stated that recognition must be constructive and should not give room for unhealthy bias among followers.
7. **Empowerment**: Short and Greer (2002) saw empowerment as the ability of a leader to entrust some level of authority to subordinate employees. They stated that empowerment could influence the faster development of a given organisation. Dambe and Moorad (2008) extended this view by pointing out firstly that leadership is evolving from a control-focused leadership to an empowerment-dependent leadership. Secondly, they argued that the practice of active delegation of authority and control by leaders through empowerment would create a more result-driven organisation and make the employees develop a sense of value and purpose. Moreover, Zhang and Bartol (2010) argued that empowerment reflects a leader’s ability to distribute power and allocate more responsibilities among followers to enhance team participation and decentralised decision making. This premise by Zhang and Bartol (2010) was based on their investigation of the link between empowering leadership and employee creativity in the technology sector in China. They found that empowerment in leadership had fostered employee creativity. This view was supported by Chen et al., (2011) who confirmed that empowerment enhanced team performance.

3.5.2 **Accompanying Attributes**

Russell and Stone (2002) suggested that accompanying attributes are those which complement the functional attributes, yet are not less relevant to study the nature of the servant leader. They are:

1. **Communication**: Axelrod (2002) argued that effective leadership is largely dependent upon effective communication, and this requires the servant leader to think deeply and strategically craft what he or she says to followers. Eccles, Nohria and Berkley (2003) extend this view by stating that no action can take place within an organisation without communication. They further emphasised on the need for the servant leader to use the right words in the right way to generate the right actions from employees. However, Hackman and Johnson (2013), describe communication as a
process that is based on the transfer of symbols, which helps individuals develop meaning. Although, they emphasise that meanings are subject to interpretations, yet the overriding goal of communication by a servant leader is to develop a shared reality between the sender and the receiver. In addition, Banyte and Salickaite (2015) found that the style of communication of the servant leader could boost the drive for innovation within the organisation, if such communication is effective.

2. Credibility: Russell and Stone (2002) described credibility to be an amalgam of honesty and integrity, which is an attribute that reveals the servant leaders ability to stimulate confidence, trust and acceptance from followers. Strong and Cook (2015) found that what followers demand from leaders is trustworthiness, competence, fairness and all these make the leader exhibit credibility. Similarly, Sendjaya (2015) reported that the tendency of credibility in leaders is to create trust and greater commitment from employees. Fernando (2016) argued that a key feature of credibility as seen in a servant leader is when the leader statements correspond with their actions. He further stated that credibility makes the followers give the leaders the unexpressed validity to lead them.

3. Visibility: According to Russell and Stone (2002), visibility is an element that supports a servant leader’s integrity in that the leader’s presence, behaviours and interactions need to be seen by the followers. They suggest that a leader’s effectiveness is revealed when he is visible in leading, showing concern, empathy and competence to his followers. This view correlates with that of Focht and Ponton (2015) who pointed out that the attributes of a servant leader would not be fully effective in practice if the servant leader is not visible. Similarly, Sousa and Van Dierendonck (2017) asserted that the visibility of a servant leader’s conduct and character is
important for effective leadership within an organisation. They suggest that a leader’s integrity can only be assessed if the leader is visible.

4. Competence: Greenleaf (1977, p.16) stated: “one who states the vision must elicit trust…leaders do not elicit trust unless one has confidence in their values and competence”. Nsiah and Walker (2013) argued that competence if viewed from a leadership perspective, simple reflects the servant leader’s genuine capability to undertake his or her role. They further stated that while it is important for a servant leader to have a strategic vision for the organisation, such leader must have the capacity to deliver. This, they argue, would instil employee trust, boost employee engagement and raise confidence in the leadership.

5. Influence: Hogg (2010) stated that the reason why the term ‘leadership’ and ‘influence’ are often used together is because leadership cannot be effective without influence. Similarly, Vacar (2015) argued that to understand the essence of leadership, one must also understand the importance of influence. He further emphasised influence to be a significant element of the servant leadership that adds positive value and introduce change to the organisation. Richards (2015) extends this view by pointing out that if leadership involves the act of focusing and motivating a collection of individuals within a workplace, this would not be possible without the effect of influence. A study by Tal, Schwarzwald and Koslowsky (2015) found influence as a tactic that servant leaders deployed in the following ways: persuasion; consultation; inspiration; personal appeals; coalition-building; ingratiation and pressure.

6. Encouragement: Turner (2000) argued that the servant leader is a leader who consistently encourages and praises team members. Similarly, Mittal and Dorfman
(2012) recognise encouragement as a tool the servant leader uses to make team members feel valued and have a sense of belonging in the organisation. Likewise, in a study on leadership effectiveness by Sadeghi and Pihie (2012), they found that among other attributes, encouragement was one that made leadership effective.

As a follow up on the reviewed attributes above, as speculated by Russell and Stone (2002), Patterson (2003) also characterised the servant leader as one with:

1. **Agapao love**: Patterson (2003) explained that the hallmark of a relationship between the servant leader and the follower is centred on Agapao love. This is derived from Winston’s (2003) philosophical consideration of the term ‘agape’ to refer to love that is socially and morally acceptable. He identified the servant leader as one whose love for the follower is based on the leader’s acceptance of the fact that the follower is an individual with needs, wants and desirous of care and attention.

   According to Hirschy et al., (2014), the sense of value and humaneness that is demonstrated through a servant leader’s Agapao love, extends such leader from just a leader to a friend of the follower. However, Roberts (2014) answered the question as to how effective a servant leader can bring about corrective practices while embracing the tenet of Agapao love. He argued that support for employees can still be shown toughly but in love, especially when it is for the good of the not only the employee, but the organisation. This view is supported by Tiftik et al, (2015) who argued that the agapao love shown by the servant leader has ethical boundaries. This implies that such love is based on the servant leader doing the right thing at the right time for the right reasons, with the interest of the follower and organisation in context.

2. **Humility**: According to Patterson (2003), humility refers to a representation of the servant leader’s ability to view his talents, interests and achievements from an appropriate perspective. Similarly, Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) stated that
humility is a virtue that signifies the right attitude that a servant leader has about his or her self-identity. They maintain that it exhibits a habit in which the servant leader thinks of himself in moderation. Moreover, Owens and Hekman (2012) extend these views by looking at humility not only from the servant leader’s perspective, but in his or her relationship with followers. They argue that humility is related first to an acknowledgement of the servant leader’s accurate perception of self and second, to the servant leader’s recognition of the strength and contributions of followers while having a mindset that is agreeable to learning from followers.

3. Altruism: Patterson (2003) described altruism as the concern leaders have for the welfare of employees. His description signified the willingness of leaders to go to lengths to care for and improve the welfare of employees even if it involved personal sacrifice to the leader. In looking at altruism from a servant leadership perspective, Sosik and Godshalk (2000) argued that it represents a behaviour driven towards ensuring the fulfilment of others. This notion was further emphasised when Dennis and Bocarnea (2005) identified the use of personal sacrifices and the ability to endure hardships as clear signs of altruism in a servant leader. Furthermore, Panaccio et al., (2015) claimed that altruism is a virtue that is indicative of the servant leader due to the deep level of concern and practical support demonstrated.

3.6 Conclusion

The main goal of this chapter was to explore leadership and the main issues surrounding leadership from philosophical, historical and conceptual perspectives. After reviewing the philosophical evidences related to the leadership phenomenon, this chapter provided a concise definition of leadership as:

“Leadership is a formal or informal contextually rooted and goal-influencing process that occurs between a leader and a follower, groups of followers,
or institutions. The science of leadership is the systematic study of this process and its outcomes, as well as how this process depends on the leader’s traits and behaviours, observer inferences about the leader’s characteristics, and observer attributions made regarding the outcomes of the entity led” (Antonakis and Day; 2017, p. 5).

This definition is synonymous with numerous definitions of leadership in that the verb “influence” appears to be a common connotation in their definitions of the leadership phenomenon. This chapter has shown that there are different styles of leadership because different schools of thought on leadership have emerged over time. However, it categorised these leadership styles into classical and contemporary approaches of leadership. It identified and explained the classical forms of leadership such as Autocratic, Democratic, Collective, and Laissez-faire leadership. Following this, was a conceptual explanation of the contemporary forms of leadership which include transactional, leader-member exchange, transformational, ethical, spiritual and authentic leadership. The overview of these leadership styles contributed to the understanding of the emergence of servant leadership, which is the primary focus of this research.

There are many definitions of servant leadership and the common definitions state that servant leadership as new leadership model that places serving others as dominant priority (Spears, 1996). Servant leadership was also defined as an emergent leadership style that has high emphasis on service to followers, a holistic approach to work and one that upholds a sense of alliance and participation in decision-making processes (Patterson, 2003). However, on the basis of the preceding analysis, this research adopts the definition of Greenleaf because it presents a robust view of what servant leadership represents. Greenleaf’s well-known definition of servant leadership stated that:
“The Servant-Leader is servant first….It begins with a natural feeling that one wants to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead…The best test, and difficult to administer is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in the society? Will they benefit, or at least not further be harmed?” (1977, p. 4).

Having defined what servant leadership is, this chapter explained servant leadership in terms of its characteristics and attributes. The characteristics of servant leadership are listening, empathy, emotional healing, awareness, persuasion, foresight, conceptualization, stewardship, growth and community building (Spears, 1995). The attributes of servant leadership as developed by Russell and Stone (2002), are vision, honesty and integrity, service, trust, pioneering, appreciation of others, empowerment, communication, credibility, visibility, competence, influence and encouragement. This study has adopted all the above characteristics as well as Russell and Stone’s attributes of vision, empowerment, appreciation of others, visibility and communication that are investigated through the study.
Chapter Four: Leadership Theories – A theoretical analysis.

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter provided a conceptual analysis of the concept of leadership. While this chapter provides a theoretical analysis by reviewing the main theories and studies of leadership. It starts with an overview of the evolution of leadership theories and then reviews critically the application of leadership theories and clarifies the implication of their implementation in organisations across cultures.

Also, this chapter examines the interactions between servant leadership and culture in relation to employee performance. As the central aim of this chapter is to explore and critically investigate the theory of servant leadership; it inspects how servant leadership can function within organisations, as this contribution would broaden understanding of servant leadership research from an African perspective.

4.2 Evolution of Leadership Theories

In making attempts to emphasise the continuity of research of the leadership phenomenon, most early studies and even current research on leadership draw attention to the evolution of the theories of leadership. However, one of the earliest studies (Stogdill, 1975) drew a distinction between two major schools of thought of leadership. He argued that while environmentalists had a view of leadership as an outcome of circumstance and a focus of group activities, the personalists inferred that leadership is the outcome of understanding the personality traits of the individual known as ‘leader’. However, in his analysis of the philosophy of Socrates, Tucker (1997) argued that Socrates’ ideology of the leader viewing the follower as an opponent may have further informed other leadership thinkers as Plato, Xenophon and Aristophanes.
On the contrary, Northhouse (2014) argued that the earliest written representations on the theory of Leadership is traceable to Machiavelli’s *The Prince* (1531/2005) which portrayed the leader’s tendency to manipulate followers. Following this, in the 19th century, scholars as Organ (1996); Shriberg and Shriberg (2002); Judge et al., (2002); Penny, Kelloway and O’Keefe (2015) stated that the foremost views on leadership theory were based on a trait perspective, leading to what was known as the Trait Theory or Great Man Theory.

Due to the extensiveness of leadership research, this study would not explore all the leadership theories in existence. However, the next sections would review a number of leadership theories in consecutive order in order to identify the notions of the theories, their application and limitations. According to Kim and Mauborgne (1992, p.123),

“The core of leadership cannot be concentrated to a sequence of personal attributes nor limited to a set of specific roles and activities. Leadership therefore, can be likened to the challenge of describing a bowl: which may be described in terms of the clay from which it is made, but what should be considered for accurate description is the hollow that is carved into the clay –the unseen space that defines the bowl’s shape and capacity”.

Following from the above description, Kim and Mauborgne (1992) stated that the study of leadership is a continuous activity. Similarly, Kaiser et al., (2008) argued that there has been a rise in the development of leadership theories and a transition from looking at the leadership phenomena from a philosophical to a process driven context. Leadership theories were developed in order to understand better the micro processes which include follower perceptions, emotions and cognitions (Bono and Ilies, 2006). An extension of this view was made by Erdogan and Enders (2007); and Johnson (2010) whose arguments infer that the rise in the number of leadership theories have been
established to understand more effectively macro processes such as the social-relational contexts of an organisation.

Moreover, Dinh et al., (2014) investigated the emergence of leadership theory since the beginning of the new millennium and argued that the previous decade had seen a rise in the number of leadership theories. In historical sequence, it can be seen that the quest in understanding leadership has led to a growing number of theories to emerge from the trait approach, to behavioural approaches of leadership which have been represented by the Ohio State University and Michigan study, Leadership Grid theory. This was followed by the power approach to leadership which represented the command and control leadership theory and then the Contingency/Situational approaches of leadership which included the Fiedler’s contingency theory, path-goal theory and the situational leadership. There was an extension of these theories to the transactional leadership theories which consist of the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory, to contemporary theories of leadership such as spiritual leadership theory, transformational leadership theory and servant-leadership theory.

4.3 Leadership Theory- Trait Perspective

Bass and Stogdill (1990) found that early reports on the great man theory is drawn from sociologist Jerome Dowd whose perspective upheld that in any given society, individuals possessed different levels of intelligence, moral force and energy. He pointed out that the conclusion of Jerome Dowd indicates that the superior few would always lead the majority of society. Also, in exploring the foundations of the Great Man theory, Organ (1996) pointed out that the cliché; “Leaders are born and not made” has brought about numerous debates among researchers who question it as a myth and not a reality (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). He argued that this debate reflects traditional and the mainstream of current thoughts on leadership. However, he provides several
reasons for the emergence of the Great Man trait perspective. For instance, the assertions by Aristotle who emphasised on the rank system of any society and concluded that rank is determined through the superior power revealed as virtues, knowledge, wisdom, talent and ability. Following this assertion, Aristotle stated that certain individuals are born with these virtues. Ogan (1996) also maintained that political thoughts in America in the mid-twentieth century shared the same thoughts as Aristotle.

Moreover, Shriberg and Shriberg (2002) explained that the aftermath of World War II led Western researchers to examine leadership differently from management. In doing this, research on leadership started to define what qualities a leader possessed, by looking at heroic figures with political and military influences in society. Studies of these heroic figures led to what was referred to as The Great Man theory.

This view was supported by Gregoire and Arendt (2014) who, on one hand, argued that the early 1900s brought about the earliest works on leadership and on the other hand suggested that the trait approach was driven by an identification of the personal characteristics of leaders who were perceived to be effective by followers. Therefore, the great man theory as a theory which saw the leader as an individual with inherited traits for a leadership role (Northhouse, 2014)

According to Popper (2004) and Kaplan (2013), the development of ‘the great man theory’ in the 19th century is attributable to Thomas Carlyle, a Scottish historian and writer whose public lectures described leadership from a heroic standpoint. Similarly, Spector (2016) said that Thomas Carlyle’s perception of leadership theory revealed that he believed that great men emerged as messengers of God to be heroes and these heroes become leaders through an upright process of hero worship. He cited Carlyle who in 1841, p. 21 made the following statement:

“For, as I take it, Universal History, the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at bottom the History of the Great Men”
who have worked here. They were the leaders of men, these great
ones, the modelers, patterns, and in a wide sense creators, of whatever
the general mass of men contrived to do or attain; all things that we see
standing accomplished in the world are properly the outer material
result, the practical realization and embodiment, of Thoughts that dwelt
in the Great Men sent into the world: the soul of the whole world’s
history, it may justly be considered, were the history of these.”

The statement above shows clearly Carlyle’s unequivocal proposition that leaders are
born rather than develop abilities that make them effective leaders. However, a study by
Matthews (2015) pointed out that a more concise development of the great man theory
is traceable to Galton who argued that a leader’s superior intelligence was rather
inherited than acquired. They examined Galton’s (1869) study of Hereditary Genius and
found out that Galton’s (1869) notion proposed leadership as designed for extraordinary
individuals.

Moreover, Zaccaro, Kemp and Bader (2004) describe trait leadership as an integrated
pattern of personal characteristics that are indicators of individual differences which
should drive leader effectiveness of a given group or society. Similarly, leadership
emergence was viewed as the extent of perception an individual receives of having the
likeness and qualities of a leader (Judge et al., 2002). Penny, Kelloway and O’Keefe
(2015) pointed out that the two distinct constructs of trait leadership are leadership
emergence and leadership effectiveness. In addition, they explain leadership
effectiveness as the leader’s ability to influence subordinates towards goal
accomplishment. Moreover, they clarify that the assessment of a leader’s effectiveness
is dependent upon the perception of what subordinates consider as effective leadership.

One of the major drawbacks, as evidenced above, is the inconsistency on the origin of
the ideology of the great man theory. It is apparent that the trait theory recommends that
there are peculiar traits that differentiate leaders from other individuals. However, the
next section would present an evaluation of the application of the trait theory.
4.3.1 Application of the Trait Theory

Much of the current work on the application of the trait theory of leadership relates to the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was developed by Isabel Myer and Katherine Briggs based on their assessment of the work of Carl Jung on personality. Hirsh and Kummerow (1990) argue that in spite of the existence of other personality type indicators such as the Jung Typology Test (JTT) and the Kersey Sorter, the MBTI instrument is the most commonly used to define personality types within organisations. McCrae and Costa (1989) describe MBTI as a personality assessment tool which identifies and explains the personality characteristics of individuals.

However, the insufficiency of research data on how the trait theory could be applied in organisations led to a study by Gehring (2007) on how the trait theory could be applied to a project management industry. Gehring (2007) utilised the *Myer-Briggs personality type indicator* (MBTI) as an instrument to evaluate those traits that an effective project manager should have and found that certain competencies such as achievement and action, helping and human service, impact and influence, managerial cognitive and personal effectiveness are essential for successful project leadership.

A similar research was undertaken by Cohen, Ornoy and Keren (2013) on project managers to find out if they were specific traits that project managers had that were accountable for project success. Their study involved a survey of 280 project managers and the MBTI was used as a measurement instrument for personality traits. There was an evaluation of personality traits on project managers and non-project managers. Their findings showed that project managers had certain personality type traits such as
Intuitiveness and a logical mind-set that proved more prevalent in project managers than non-project managers.

According to Wang and Walumbwa (2007), work-life supportive leadership reflects the leader’s ability to effectively utilise work-life programs within an organisation. A study by Epstein (2010) analysed theoretical antecedents of manager’s work-life supportive behaviours using trait leadership approach. He found that there was a rise in the number of employees facing work-family conflicts, which had a negative effect on organisations. He described work-family conflict as one in which the sources of conflict that emanate from the workplace could affect an employee’s work output. His study found that a major gap that was lacking in many organisations was the presence of work-life supportive leadership.

Colbert et al., (2012) carried out an assessment of personality traits with the use of self and observer ratings. They argued that previous evaluations by researchers on personality traits only utilised the self-rating system could not explain clearly the variance in leadership. They found out that 155 respondents in their research study endorsed their hypothesis that Neuroticism was negatively related to perceptions of leadership.

For the sake of clarity, Chernyshenko, Stark and Drasgow (2011) had previously defined Neuroticism as the personality trait of an individual that is demonstrated through anger, hostility and irritability and those individuals high in this trait tend to suffer from depression. The hypothesis posed by Colbert et al., (2012) suggested that Neuroticism evaluated with the use of self and observer ratings explains more variance in leadership perceptions than neuroticism evaluated with use of self-ratings alone. They maintain that the reason for the adoption of this hypothesis is that outward expressions of neuroticism such as expressions of anger and hostility towards followers would likely
influence the followers’ perceptions of leadership. Therefore, they suggest that neuroticism better explains variance in leadership perceptions using both self and observer ratings than self-ratings alone because self-ratings only focus on the internal tendencies of neuroticism.

Another aspect of trait theories of leadership that has attracted research attention is what personality psychologists refer to as the big five personality traits (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability versus Neuroticism and Openness). John and Srivastava (1999) argued that the Big Five personality dimension does not suggest that differences in personality can be reduced to the five personality traits but rather these five dimensions characterise personality at a comprehensive level of generalisation. They point out that the integration of the five-dimension structure into trait theory was developed by Goldberg in 1981, whose goal was to establish five comparatively independent dimensions that collectively present a significant categorisation for studying individual differences in personality.

A study by Rushton et al., (2007) to identify effective personality traits of teachers using the Myers-Briggs personality test, found that the most effective teachers were those who were perceived to be extraverted and intuitive. Sample (2017) reviewed the effect of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) in public affairs education and found that within the context of curriculum development, the MBTI would be useful in the integration and engagement of students in providing an effective learning framework.

Another study was undertaken by Almandeel (2014) aimed at identifying the impact of personality traits on perceptions of leadership behaviour, job satisfaction and turnover intention within the Saudi banking sector found that high conscientiousness had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. In addition, employees with high scores on
neuroticism were unlikely to view their leaders as either transformational or transactional, as compared to employees with high scores on conscientiousness.

4.3.2 Criticisms of the Trait Theory

A major weakness of the trait theory was revealed in a study by Matthews (2015) who argued that the trait theory failed to recognise the possibility of differences in situation that may influence a leader’s action. He argued that the presupposition of trait theory that certain leaders behave a particular way, fails to take cognizance of the fact that change in situations directly influence the behaviour of the leader. Similarly, scepticism of the trait theory has been from a psychological standpoint debunking the application of personality tests. The debate is that if personality tests are used to evaluate traits, then it becomes questionable as to how effective these tests are because social behaviour is majorly a function of situational limitations (Hogan, DeSoto and Solano 1977).

Furthermore, a major drawback to the psychometric properties of the MBTI is that it was formulated based upon Jungian personality concepts which have been argued to be distorted. Therefore, in the absence of bi-modal distributions of preference scores, studies utilising the MBTI cannot confirm its validity and reliability (McCrae and Costa, 1989). Another limitation of the trait theory, according to Stogdill (1974) was the impreciseness of the theory’s perspective in failing to recognise that a leader’s possession of positive traits could be inadequate in ensuring effective leadership if there is no favourable operational environment. This standpoint was the outcome of Stogdill's study of the leadership traits from 1904-1974. He also recommended the need for extensive research that would look further than leader traits and investigate on how leaders’ behaviours lead to effectiveness.
Bennis and Nanus (1985) argued that a major flaw to the trait theory of leadership was that leadership was a learned skill with no natural underpinnings. They explained that the biographies of great leaders frequently read as if such leaders were born into the world with some kind of extraordinary genetic endowment. They debate that this notion disregards the need for skillsets and competencies to be learned and developed by those who have the role to lead. However, in evaluating the trait-based leadership perspective, Bass and Stogdill (1990) offered two questions namely:

i. What are the traits that differentiate leaders from non-leaders?

ii. What is the magnitude of those differences?

In a further study by Bass (2008), he provided answers to the first question as shown above by examining traits of a leader in relation to demographics (for example, age, gender and education) and found task competence (such as Conscientiousness and Intellectual Component), and interpersonal attributes (for example, agreeableness and extraversion) as traits that distinguish leaders from non-leaders.

However, Derue et al., (2011) contend that Bass’ claim was inconclusive because there is little or no research with answers to Bass’ second question, explaining the relative magnitude of effects across leader traits and this still represents a gap in the trait theory. There is the debate against the trait theory for its inherent class prejudice. Arguments suggest that the ideology of the great man/ trait theory lays primary emphasis on men alone, thereby disregarding great leaders as Joan of Arc and Elizabeth 1 who were women (Montgomery, 2014).

In addition, Montgomery (2014) highlighted the criticisms of Hegel and Tolstoy who noted that the adoption of the “great man” ideology was a clear reflection of societal
values embraced during the 19th century and hence should not be considered as status quo for leadership.

Similarly, a study by Bono and Judge (2004) examined how traits of leaders help organisations prosper. They found that traits such as perceived influence enhance the effectiveness of leaders within organisations. However, Morgeson et al., (2007) disagrees with this finding by arguing that perceived influence is not the same as leader effectiveness. They argued that drawing upon a relationship between a personality dimension and perceived influence is not a strong foundation for the use of such measure in identifying effective leaders. Also, Judge, Piccolo and Kosalka (2009) argued that even though personality may disclose if an individual is perceived as leader-like, personality has no effective approach in recognising whether those leaders would be effective from an objective sense.

A study by Raelin (2015) revealed that the need to gain further insight on the leadership phenomenon led to transition of study and the development of the behavioural perspective of leadership. However, he suggests that this does not imply that there is no investigation of the trait theory in contemporary leadership research. The major issues regarding the trait theory was the inability to measure traits as loyalty, honesty, integrity and diligence. For this reason, another leadership theory had to be found (Bolden et al., 2003). The following section would explore the behavioural studies of leadership.

4.4 Leadership Theory- Behavioural Perspective

The need to distinguish between the leader and the behaviour of the leader had led to several studies. Unlike the trait theory of leadership which focuses on the personality characteristics of the leader, the behavioural approach looks at leadership from a different dimension. According to Northouse (2018), the primary focus of the behavioural approach is on leader’s actions. Therefore, the behavioural approach
investigates the actions of leaders by classifying their behaviours into task behaviours and relationship behaviours. While the task behaviours enable goal accomplishment by the leader helping followers achieve objectives, relationship behaviours focus on ensuring that followers feel comfortable with themselves, other members of the group and the situation at hand.

Although numerous studies have attempted to explain the behavioural approach. Some of the most prominent studies include Lewin's analysis of internal processes in organisations, group dynamism, group decisions and social change (Likert 1961; Blake and Mouton 1964; Coghlan and Brannick, 2003). Others include The Ohio State University study in the late 1940s, The University of Michigan study in the early 1960s, and more recently the Leadership Grid model which has become an effective global tool used in consulting for organisational development (Northouse, 2018).

Moreover, Allport (1948) and Burns (2004) reported that the significance of that Lewin’s study was that it emphasised that “the group to which an individual belongs is the ground for his perceptions, feelings and actions”. These descriptions of the leader’s behaviour led to the introduction of the following leadership approaches follows:

4.4.1 The Autocratic or Directive Leadership Approach

Autocratic leadership is a leadership approach categorised by the centralisation and control of decision-making and directive power in an individual dominant leader (Lippitt, 1940). Moreover, Cremer (2006) explained that autocratic leadership symbolises how dominant and controlling a leader is in the process of discussing opinions and ideas leading to the actual decision taken in the group.

Furthermore, Bass and Bass (2009) support and extend this view by emphasising that autocratic leadership enables the leader to establish a well-defined intra-team hierarchy even as the leader’s behaviour indicates the zeal to centralize authority and dictate work
patterns with restricted involvement of employees. Vann, Coleman and Simpson (2014) argued that the collective notion of autocratic leadership is that it represents the natural embodiment of Machiavelli’s well-known dictum: it is better to be feared than loved, if one cannot be both (Machiavelli, 1998.p. 67). However, Bass and Bass (2009) maintain that all autocratic leaders are not dictators despite the fact their leadership style could be seen as controlling, power-oriented, arbitrary, punitive and close-minded.

Javidan et al., (2006) pointed out that the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness) program suggested the preference of autocratic leaders to democratic leaders in many cultures across Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, Central and South America due to cultural elements as power distance, uncertainty avoidance, just to mention a few. He further stated that what many Western schools of thought on leadership identify as bad leadership behaviours might in reality be the required and most suitable behaviour needed for effective group performance in other cultures.

According to Hofstede (1980, p. 57),

“The crucial fact about leadership in any culture is that it is a complement to subordinateship. Whatever a naïve literature on leadership may give us to understand, leaders cannot choose their styles at will; what is feasible depends to a large extent on the cultural conditioning of a leader’s subordinates”.

Similarly, Muczyk and Adler (2002, p.3) provided this remark:

“Unqualified support for democratic leaders and individual autonomy has been the cultural norm of US society since the end of World War I (WWI). Most of the post WWII leadership literature has been generated by American scholars. Consequently, the democratic predispositions found in the U.S. culture were assimilated into leadership literature, consciously or otherwise. The predilection toward democracy is strengthened by the tendency for certain words, such as “autocratic” and “directive”, to take on a pejorative connotation irrespective of their denotation".
Muczyk and Holt (2008) agree with the cultural dimensions of Hofstede and argue that the effectiveness of autocratic leadership style may be found in cultures that are high in power distance, masculinity, collectivism and uncertainty avoidance are influenced by external environmental orientation. They propose that the practise of the autocratic leadership style may be more suitable in cultures that are predisposed to accepting hierarchy and those cultures that are unwilling to avoid structural chains of command.

There have been numerous studies on autocratic leadership which would be looked into in the next section.

4.4.1.1 Application of Autocratic Leadership Approach

In a study investigating how managers and administrators function in Africa, Kiggundu, Jørgensen and Hafsi (1983) found that African organisations were in nature bureaucratic, hierarchical with a one-way communication process primarily from the top to the bottom. Five years later, Kiggundu (1988, p. 226) made this remarkable statement describing the degree to which leadership in African organisations were highly authoritarian:

“There is an acute shortage of quality leadership and management in Africa. Prevailing management styles are authoritarian, personalized, politicized, and not conducive to management development and the emergence of new leadership. Entrepreneurial, creative, and development talents are suppressed in favour of bureaucratic, risk-aversive administration based on absolute obedience.”

Similarly, in a study to identify a culture-fit model for managing organisational effectiveness in sub-Saharan Africa, Beugre and Offodile (2001) argued that even though traditional African societies are characterised by consensus building, there is a tendency for African managers in modern organisations to be autocratic. They maintain that the African culture is inclined to not control its external environment but rather comply with its will. They stated that the implication of this is an intolerance for uncertainty and a low level of acceptance to change, but rather the preference of
predictable situations. Their findings support earlier arguments by Salah (1985) who observed that in Kenya and other sub-Saharan countries, traditional values influence modern organisational practise in such a way that employees follow the direction of leaders without questioning them.

In support of the findings by Blunt and Jones (1997); Beugre (1998) argued that leadership styles in African modern organisations is demonstrated through high level centralized power structures, focus on control mechanisms, a lot of uncertainty instead of an emphasis on organisational performance and the acceptance of positive change. They conclude their argument by suggesting that autocratic leadership styles in African modern organisations may lead to decision-making that is impulsive and repressive.

In evaluating leadership styles in Africa, Kuada (2010) reaches the conclusion that even though business leaders in Africa do not demonstrate behaviours linked to transformational leadership, they adopt a relationship management approach that patronise their followers rather than encourages their inner motivation to show commitment to organisational goal attainment. This position by Kuada (2010) is an advancement of what he had termed as autocratic-benevolence in 1994. He argued that despite the demonstration of autocratic leadership behaviours, African business leaders have the tendency to provide special opportunities, incentives and privileges to those followers who are closest and subservient to them. He identified examples of some of these privileges as: speedy career promotions, being selected for overseas training workshops and approving loan applications. However, Kuada (2010) draws a distinction between individual/organisational performance and the need for the leader to sustain superior-subordinate relationships driven by the reciprocity of support and benefits.

Another study was carried out by Huda (2014) who examined the autocratic style of leadership which he claimed was the common practice within the nursing sector in
Pakistan. He argued that the implication of autocratic leadership to the nursing profession was the high turnover of nurses, low morale and motivation of nurses, less diversity among nursing staff and lack of innovation. His arguments were based on what he had observed, having worked within the nursing sector for years. Huda (2014) reported that the solution to ineffective leadership within the nursing sector, is the replacement of the autocratic leadership style with a transformational leadership approach. The reason behind this suggestion is that transformational leadership improves job satisfaction, employee motivation, workplace innovation and serves a pillar for building future competent leaders.

Chege, Wachira and Mwenda (2015) drew attention to outcomes of autocratic leadership when they investigated its effects in the implementation of strategic plans in Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Nairobi, Kenya. Their findings from the study of managers and sole proprietors of 123 SMEs revealed that autocratic leadership led to efficient execution of strategic plans within their businesses and that the use of punishment by business owners improved strategic plans. Their findings relate with those of Murigi (2013) whose study on the impact of autocratic leadership to employee performance concluded that the autocratic leader’s primary focus is on getting things done. To achieve this, he argued that the use of absolute supervision, punishments and direct command structures improved employee performance.

Ndubueze and Akanni (2015) investigated the effects of autocratic leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB) of employees of private companies in the Eastern Region of Nigeria. They found that autocratic leadership would not help leaders within the private sector understand the work conditions that drive organisational citizenship behaviour. As a result, they revealed that an inverse relationship existed between autocratic leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour. Ndubueze and Akanni (2015) concluded that private companies as investigated should adopt a
democratic leadership approach which they showed had a significant positive relationship with organisational citizenship behaviour.

Another study was conducted by Okoji (2015) on the relationship between School Principals’ styles of leadership and teachers’ job performance in Ondo State of Nigeria. He proposed that school principals should combine the use of autocratic and democratic leadership styles as their leadership approach to improve teacher’s job performance. However, he supported the earlier opinions of Ezeuwa (2005) who recommended that the democratic leadership style is a better predictor of teachers’ job satisfaction and school achievement. Furthermore, Okoji (2015) identified the significance of democratic leadership style in school administration as it would enhance a participative working environment where teachers work together to solve organisational challenges. However, his finding revealed that autocratic leadership style could be effective in some situations where there is an urgent demand for improved productivity and a need to address issues related to teachers’ negligence of duty. Therefore, he recommended an amalgamation of both leadership styles.

Furthermore, Feng Li (2014) carried out a comparative study between Ancient Chinese and Western leadership practices and found that inspite of the claim that Chinese organisations had adopted contemporary leadership practices, many organisations still had autocratic leadership in practise. He drew a distinction by underlining that while many of the western business leadership theories were influenced by an ideology of systems thinking in which the organisation is seen as a system that has leaders with shared mission and visions to support that system, the Chinese business leadership model was quite different. Therefore, he argued that the Chinese business leaders believe that the overall system (referring to the organisation) is ruled by them and that the system should only listen to what they have to say and obey. His finding is congruent to the assertion by Li and Wright (2000) which supports his claim that many
of the Chinese business leaders see their employees like chess pieces in the game of business.

Also, in the analysis of leadership styles in school districts in relation to school improvement in the Eastern Cape province of South Africa, Moorosi and Bantwini (2016) concluded that there was the prevalence of a combination of leadership styles such as democratic and autocratic leadership and a low degree of laissez-faire behaviours. They found that the principals' complained of their lack of participation in the decision making involving their district leadership and argued that while this indicates a lack of confidence from the district leadership towards the principals, it reflected the presence of autocratic leadership behaviours that bypassed the need for collaboration.

Having explored a number of studies on autocratic leadership, the subsequent section would outline a number of criticisms that have emerged against this leadership approach.

4.4.1.2 Criticisms of Autocratic Leadership Approach

Critics such as Burns (2004) have questioned the autocratic leadership approach for its tendency to drive high turnover rates of followers, a tendency for employee to become less innovative, reduced follower motivation and morale, low job satisfaction and low organisational loyalty. Vugt et al., (2004) argued that within western democratic cultures, autocratic leadership does not provide a viable long-term solution to social dilemmas in open group settings. In an open group setting, an autocratic leadership style would make the leader unable to secure the welfare of the group in the long-run which would lead to the exit of group members.

Another weakness of this leadership approach was revealed by Iqbal, Anwar and Haider (2015) who contended that since the autocratic leadership style is influenced by
an “I tell” and “You do” philosophy, it could lead to the leaders undermining the input from followers which may support an organisation in reaching its objective. More recently, Nevicka et al., 2018 expressed their criticism of the autocratic leadership approach when they stated, that there is more tendency for an autocratic leader to develop narcissistic behaviours than other participatory leadership styles. This they argued was because of the leader’s high visibility, low follower responses and a high level of absenteeism in group-level dynamics. Therefore, they explain that this effect could make an autocratic leader no longer see his or her followers as assets to the company.

4.4.2 The Democratic or Participative Leadership Approach

Gastil (1994) argued that early definitions of democratic leadership could be attributed to Kurt Lewin who in 1969 described the democratic leader as the kind of leader whose behaviour demonstrates willingness to encourage employee participation, empowers employees’ and utilises feedback as an instrument in coaching employees. More than two decades later, Gastil (1994) extends the school of thought regarding the definition of democratic leadership by seeing democratic leadership as the outcome of three functions namely:

a) Distribution of Responsibility.

Whitehead (1936) argued that since a democratic society is categorised by a distribution of personal responsibility, it could be suggested that the central aim of democratic leadership is to drive opportunities that make it possible for team members to initiate ideas and develop a sense of responsibility to contribute towards the overall agenda of the group. Similarly, Krech et al., (1962) proposed that the democratic leader is determined to promote maximum involvement and the participation of every team member in group tasks and in evaluating group objectives.
b). Empowerment of Team Members

Lewin et al., (1939) drew attention that a distinguishing function of the democratic leader is that he or she is directly involved in providing new responsibilities to team members to enable them develop their skills. Correspondingly, Starhawk (1986) stress that the democratic leader reflects genuine concern for team members even as they empower them to achieve set objectives. Theilen and Poole (1986) argue that the overall aim of empowering team members by the democratic leader is to make team members learn to become leaders.

c). Aiding Deliberation

Yankelovich (1991) asserted that at the centre of democracy is deliberation. He further stated that after the democratic leader has distributed responsibility and empowered team members, it then becomes imperative for such leader to drive a process that leads to effective and democratic decision-making. This view was supported by Morse (1991) who stressed that for democratic leadership to be productive, there must be a high quality deliberation within the group.

Gastil (1994) advised that the process of deliberation by a democratic leader is achievable through constructive participation, facilitation, the sustenance of healthy relationship and the presence of a positive emotional setting within the group. He further highlights that constructive participation involves a process of defining, analysing and solving group problems through deliberation. He suggested that a typical example of constructive participation is by the leader displaying the act of listening. Gastil (1994) recommends the perspective of Sheeran (1983) who urged that a democratic leader carefully and critically listens to the ideas and opinions of team members in order to identify a solution that optimally represents the collective interests of the group.
There have been several investigations into the application of democratic leadership within organisations. The following section would consider a few of these studies.

4.4.2.1 Application of Democratic Leadership Approach

Shamaki (2015) carried out a study to determine the most effective leadership that would enhance teacher’s productivity in public secondary schools in Taraba, Nigeria. He found democratic leadership as the most appropriate, after a comparative analysis of the significance of democratic and authoritarian leadership to teacher’s productivity. He suggested that there should be an emphasis of the democratic leadership style in schools administration in Nigeria. In addition, he proposed the need for the ministry of education to organise workshops to create awareness on the necessity of democratic leadership.

On the contrary, Liphadzi, Aigbavboa and Thwala (2015) examined the effects of leadership styles on project success in the South African construction industry. Their results revealed a weak correlation between democratic leadership and project success. The implication of the findings practically show that democratic leadership style within the South African construction industry would not lead to much project success.

A study examining the effects of leadership on a firm’s performance in Ghana was conducted by Puni, Ofei and Okoe (2014). The study evaluated the impact leadership styles tin relation to the financial performance of two Ghanaian banks. Their results showed that even though no leadership style significantly predicted the financial performance of the two banks, the democratic style accounted for more variance. As a result, they endorse the democratic leadership style for firms that want to sustain a motivated workforce and remain competitive and effective in achieving high financial performance.
In contrast, Zhang et al., (2015) studied the effects of leadership style on talent retention during Merger and Acquisition integration from a Chinese perspective. Zhang et al. argued that the practice of democratic leadership styles would likely be ineffective immediately after an acquisition because employees from the acquired firm would not be well informed of what to do. They corroborate their analysis of the study with Goleman (2000) who posits that democratic leadership styles make less sense if employees lack the competence to provide sound advice. As such, they found that democratic leadership was inappropriate during post-merger integration in China.

The issue of leadership styles and their effect on the motivation of employees in Pakistan was investigated by Fiaz, Su and Saqib (2017). They examined the challenge of leadership ineffectiveness within the public sector of Pakistan with the primary objective of determining the leadership style that is most effective in increasing employee motivation. They utilised the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to obtain data from 110 participants. They found that the work culture in the public sector of Pakistan was controlled by a negative bureaucratic environment. Their findings revealed that the democratic leadership style positively was a positive predictor of employees’ motivation. However, they pointed out that the positive relationship between democratic leadership and employees’ motivation was insignificant, which they argued indicates the bureaucratic nature of organisations in Pakistan. As a result, they recommended, the adoption of democratic leadership style by top management leaders as a key way of strengthening their organisations. In addition, they argued that organisations should implement leadership development programs as they positively affect the democratic leadership style.

Owolabi (2015) conducted a study on the impact of organisational culture and leadership style on quality of work-life among employees in Nigeria. The study involved a selection of 284 employees from private and public organisations in Ekiti State in
Nigeria. They tested a hypothesis that predicted that employees who perceived democratic leadership will experience positive quality of work life than employees who perceived the autocratic leadership style. Their hypothesis could not be confirmed because even though the results revealed a significant effect of leadership style on the quality of work life, it also showed that autocratic leadership style had a higher mean score than the democratic leadership style.

The influence of education on the application of leadership styles in the agricultural private sector was investigated by Kotur and Anbazhagan (2014). They looked at the different leadership styles demonstrated in India. Their study focused on democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership. They found that employees with higher education had the inclination to practise democratic leadership, whereas those with minimal education had the tendency to utilise the autocratic leadership style.

A recent study on the relationship between leadership styles and employee engagement was undertaken by Yao et al., (2017). They provided evidences from construction companies in Malaysia. Having also considered the laissez-faire, democratic and autocratic leadership styles, they found that while all three leadership styles had a significant relationship with employee engagement, the democratic leadership style had a stronger association.

More recently, Ngotngamwong (2018) studied the effects of democratic leadership on teacher job satisfaction in Thailand and found that the democratic leadership style had a significant positive effect on job satisfaction. As a result, they recommend school administrators to increase the use of democratic leadership style in order to enhance job satisfaction.
4.4.2.2 Criticisms of Democratic Leadership Approach

The democratic leadership approach has been questioned for being time consuming and very difficult to handle in a practical organisational settings. Khan et al., (2015) stated that the drive for the democratic leader to reach a consensus could be problematic in situations that require immediate decision-making. They also contend that there may be scenarios in the organisation that requires a demonstration of autocratic leadership behaviour, and that the use of the democratic leadership approach would not lead to effective problem-solving.

This section has reviewed a number of studies on the application and criticisms of the democratic leadership style. In addition, it has presented a range of findings based on the studies. The next section would explore the laissez-faire leadership style.

4.4.3 The Laissez-Faire Leadership Theory

Bradford and Lippitt (1945) defined a laissez-faire leader as one exemplified by a neglect of supervisory functions and lack of guidance to subordinates. They emphasised that a typical laissez-faire leader is such a leader whose behaviour encourages almost absolute freedom to subordinates in undertaking their job functions as well as in decision-making processes. Similarly, Bass (1998) argued that the paradox of laissez faire leadership is that it indicates the absence of leadership and a behaviour of a leader who abdicates his or her authority. Furthermore, Louw and Venter, (2011) simply describes laissez faire leadership as a non-description leadership approach that avoids leading. A growing number of studies that have examined the application of laissez-faire leadership within organisations.
4.4.3.1 Application of Laissez-Faire Leadership Theory

Lewin et al., (1939) carried out early investigations of the laissez-faire leadership theory. They examined a boys' club led by adults displaying either the laissez-faire or democratic leadership style to determine their effects. Their findings indicated that the team led with the laissez-faire leadership approach was in a disorderly state, their work output was of poor quality, and their productivity remained ineffective. Their findings corroborate with Morse (1950) who investigated a particular team in a railroad organisation that was given absolute control of their job functions and in decision-making. Their findings showed that the team became less productive and had a low quality of work due to the absence of leadership direction in decision-making processes. As a result, they propose the laissez-faire leadership style as the most ineffective leadership approach.

A study conducted by Vrba (2007) analysed the relationships between emotional intelligence skills and leadership behaviours among a sample of South African first-line managers in the insurance sector. The study involved an evaluation of 60 first-line managers by over 314 close associates in an attempt to probe if the managers’ emotional intelligence skills such as self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation were an indicator of such managers’ proclivity to demonstrate certain leadership behaviours. The investigation observed the negative impact of a laissez-faire manager to the organisation in that he or she has subordinates who are not equipped with clear expectations. In addition, he found that the laissez-faire manager exhibits a behaviour in which they fail to address internal conflicts among team because he or she has no central role in the decision-making process. In conclusion, the study provided strong evidence that there is a negative correlation between emotional intelligence skills and the laissez-faire leadership style.
Moreover, Chaudhry and Javed (2012) investigated the impact of the laissez faire leadership style on motivation in the banking sector of Pakistan. Having analysed data from 278 participants, their findings revealed an insignificant relationship between laissez faire leadership and the motivation of employees. They argued that the non-involvement of leaders in decision-making would not be effective because the working culture of Pakistan is such that the transformational and transactional has a positive relationship with motivational levels of employees.

Also, Nyengane (2007) explored the relationship between laissez-faire leadership and organisational commitment in an electricity private sector company known as Eskom in South Africa. He utilised the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Full Range Leadership Development Theory instruments to gather data from 86 leaders and 334 non-leaders within the company. He found out that there was a negative association between laissez faire leadership and affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment which are components of organisational commitment. His study proposed the significance of transformational and transactional leadership behaviours in determining levels of affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. For this reason, he proposed that laissez-faire leadership style would not be an appropriate leadership approach for the electricity private sector as it has no contribution to enhancing the drivers of organisational commitment.

Adeyemi (2010) examined the leadership styles of principals in relation to teachers’ job performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. The specific findings of the study revealed that teachers’ job performance was more effective in schools that employed the autocratic leadership style than in schools that deployed the democratic and laissez-faire leadership approach. The reason for this is because the organisational culture in the schools demanded a leadership style in which some teachers had to be forced to achieve productivity.
Therefore, Adeyemi (2010) recommended that the principals should not use the laissez faire leadership style because it would not promote higher teachers’ job performance. A similar study by Imhangbe, Okecha and Obozuwa (2018) on the impact of principals’ leadership styles and teacher’s job performance through a case study of senior secondary schools in Edo State, Nigeria. They utilised instruments as the Principals Leadership Style Questionnaire (PLESQUE) and the Teachers Job Performance Questionnaire (TEJOPAQ). Their most salient finding was that laissez-faire leadership had positive yet limited significance on teachers’ job performance. However, they recommend the democratic leadership style as the leadership approach with the most significant relationship to teachers’ job performance. As a result, they propose that if at all the laissez faire leadership is to be implemented, the schools should utilise caution due to its negative effects on teachers’ job performance.

However, a study by Skogstad et al., (2007) examined the assumption that laissez faire leadership is not a form of zero-leadership but rather a destructive leadership behaviour that reveals systematic relationships with bullying at work, workplace stressors and psychological distress. They analysed data obtained from a survey of 2,273 Norwegian employees and found laissez faire leadership more of a counterproductive leadership style than a zero-leadership style. In addition, their study showed laissez faire leadership within a stressful work environment would promote high levels of role stress and interpersonal conflicts. They propose that organisations should avoid laissez faire leadership because laissez faire leaders promote work environments with high levels of interpersonal stressors.

Buch, Martinsen and Kuvaas (2015) argued that the mechanisms through which laissez-faire leadership approach negatively impacts effective employee outcomes has not received adequate attention. In providing an answer to their claim, they undertook an investigation of the destructiveness of laissez- faire leadership by looking at the
mediating role of economic leader-member exchange relationships. In their study, the question under discussion is what is the mediating role of economic leader-member exchange (ELMX) on the negative relationships between laissez-faire leadership and affective commitment, self-reported work effort and self-organisational citizenship behaviour? Their probe involved the use of two sample studies.

While the first study comprised of 199 employees of an international technology company, the second study involved 197 employees of an international private security firm. The first study discovered that ELMX fully mediated the negative relationship between laissez-faire and affective commitment only. Whereas, the second study highlighted that ELMX fully mediated the negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership and self-reported work effort and had a partial mediation with self-reported organisational citizenship behaviour.

In addition, there was an evaluation of how leadership styles influences the creativity of employees within the Hungarian labour context by Derecskei (2016). A research sample of 600 Hungarian employees was selected to appraise the leadership styles that proved to enhance their individual creativity in the workplace. The analysis of the data derived from participants pointed out that laissez-faire leadership style had no effect on workplace creativity, whereas the democratic leadership had a significant positive effect on organisational productivity. He posited that the reason for the non-impact of the laissez-faire leadership style to workplace creativity was the basis that the non-participatory behaviour of the laissez-faire leader makes him or her neither influence the initiation of new ideas nor the implementation of them.

Although many studies have identified a correlation between laissez-faire leadership and ineffective leadership or poor job outcomes, these notions are not in consensus. Several researchers have discovered a positive perspective of the laissez-faire
leadership approach. For example, a study by Yang (2015) attempted to ascertain if there were positive effects of laissez-faire leadership on the workplace. He found that the reason why existing literature on laissez-faire leadership had a negative perspective is because the construct was being viewed only from a one-dimensional viewpoint. He disagrees with Skogstad et al., (2007) who described the laissez-faire leader as such a leader that reflects avoidance, ignorance and neglect of subordinates’ needs. Yang (2015) postulates that there could be times when subordinates appreciate distance from their leaders, as it may help them become more confident in their tasks thereby enhancing individual creativity and work quality. He asserted that the majority of literature on laissez-leadership have failed to examine if there are benefits of non-involvement from the leader to subordinates.

Furthermore, Yang (2015) agreed with Ryan and Tipu (2013) who suggested that laissez-faire leadership approach has the tendency to establish a workplace that is easier to drive innovation. He also proposes that laissez-faire leadership should not be defined as the absence of leadership but rather seen as a strategic behavioural choice of a leader. In addition, he suggests that the autonomy laissez-faire leaders provide could enhance team member’s level of self-determination and build their task competencies.

Similarly, Chege et al., (2015) investigated the effects of laissez-faire leadership style on the implementation of organisation strategic plans in small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Nairobi, Kenya. The analysis of the data collected showed that laissez-faire leadership had no significant correlation to organisational performance. Although they recommend that managers should abandon the use of the laissez-faire approach and be more involved with team members’ so as to boost easy decision-making for complex situations, they disagree that laissez-faire leadership promotes low motivation as inferred by Chaudhry and Javed (2012). However, they endorse the use of laissez-faire
leadership approach in situations where employees already possess high skills and competencies to undertake their tasks effectively without interference.

4.5 Application of the Behavioural Theory of Leadership.

There have been numerous studies to investigate the application of behavioural theories to leadership. This is because researchers have sought to understand the role of behaviour in defining effective and ineffective leaders. Two of the major significant studies are the Ohio State University and University of Michigan studies which have provided the framework for further researches on leadership behaviour. The next section would review both studies.

4.5.1 Ohio State University Study

Hemphill (1949) stated that the focus of leadership research by social scientists had always been based upon the key requirement to identify and clarify on the perspectives of a leader’s activities. He argued that for leadership to be considered as successful, there must be a determination of the kinds of behaviour which group members identify as conducive for effective leadership. The above assumption gave rise to a group of researchers to study behavioural perspectives of leadership at the Ohio State University. Stogdill and Coons (1957), stated that the Ohio State University research group coordinated by Carroll Shartle brought psychologists and researchers together in the 1950s with the main objective of identifying behavioural indicators of effective leadership that could apply to leaders universally. The Ohio State University study commenced with the development of questionnaire designed to evaluate diverse leadership behaviours in organisations. The questionnaire was initiated by Hemphill (1949) with the collection of over 1,800 items that defined leadership behaviours. Hemphill and Coons, (1957) observed that there was a breakdown of these items into
150 statements, which were used to produce a questionnaire known as the Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

Halpin and Winer (1957) identified the LBDQ (Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire) instrument as an effective tool used by civilian and military personnel to appraise the behaviours demonstrated by their supervisors. The significance of the LBDQ was to provide measurable statistical data which could be analysed the two main dimensions of leadership known as Consideration and Initiating Structure. Following this, the Ohio State researchers extended their examination of leadership behaviours by developing the Supervisory Descriptive Behaviour Questionnaire (SBDQ). According to Fleishman (1972), the SBDQ represented a questionnaire which assessed the degree to which leaders within the industrial settings demonstrated behaviours termed as consideration and initiating structure behaviours. These behaviours are described later in this section.

Similarly, the Ohio State University studies on leadership represent an attempt to establish a set of objective methods through which leadership could be measured. To achieve this, the study needed the distinction among variables which could be accurately measured whether as formal or informal variables (Grint, 1997) illustrated that the Ohio study hypothesized that if leadership was to be evaluated by the influence of individuals on organisational activities, what was the outcome of the idea of leadership being an essential social process? Their answer was that leadership is evident through the activities of an individual, and that although these activities are comparable to those of others, they are embedded in social processes.

Later, Yukl (1971) argued that although the outcome of the Ohio State University research group led to the identification of over 2,000 leadership behaviours, they were notable for initiating two major dimensions of leadership behaviour known as
Consideration and the Initiating Structure. These leadership behaviours were designed to establish an understanding of the perceptions subordinates had towards their leaders' behaviours. Below is a brief description of these leadership behaviours.

I. Consideration: Fleishman and Harris (1953) describe Consideration as a behaviour that represents mutual trust, respect and a high degree of warmth and understanding between leaders and followers. They maintain that Consideration lays high emphasis on a leader’s profound concern for the needs of followers and a demonstration of a behaviour that encourages them effectively participate in decision-making.

The description above corroborates with the assertion by Bass (1990) who referred to Consideration as the extent to which a leader expresses concern for followers’ welfare, shows appreciation and support. Yukl (2002) extends this view by giving practical examples of Consideration as a leadership behavioural construct. He suggested that practical illustrations of consideration could be demonstrated when leaders find time to listen to subordinates’ challenges, undertake personal favours for subordinates like assisting them in finding a special training course to boost their skill levels, even if external to the organisation. Other examples include the willingness of the leader to consider suggestions from subordinates and treat subordinates as equal “human beings”, promoting a friendly work environment. The opposite of Consideration can be characterised by an inconsiderate leader who criticises his or her followers in front of others, utilises threats and refuses to accept valid suggestions and constructive criticisms from followers.

II. Initiating Structure: This reflects a behaviour in which the leader defines and organises group activities that involve him/her and group members. The aim is to attain objectives and establish concrete communication channels and workflow patterns within the group. (Fleishman, 1962; pp: 43-44). In addition, Yukl (2002) identified practical examples of
the representation of Initiating Structure to include: allocating tasks to subordinates; initiating and implementing definite performance standards; requesting subordinates to adhere to standard policies; providing innovative methods to solve current problems; and coordinating subordinates’ activities.

There is a rapidly growing literature on these leadership behaviours (Northouse, 2001). There was a study by Judge et al., (2013) to examine the validity of Consideration and Initiating Structure in leadership research. Their investigation provided a meta-analysis of the relationships between both dimensions to leadership which led to an analysis of 163 independent correlations and 159 non-independent correlations for Consideration and Initiating Structure respectively. They found that while Consideration had a significant relationship with job satisfaction, follower and leader satisfaction, motivation and leader effectiveness, Initiating Structure was slightly strongly related to leader job performance and group-organisation performance. Moreover, Piccolo et al., (2012) explored these behavioural categories by looking at their relative impact to leadership within the organisation. They focused their objective on determining the kind of relationship that existed between transformational leadership, consideration and initiating structure, as well as the outcomes of their relationship. They found that consideration had a strong link with job satisfaction while initiation had a direct correlation with job performance. They also identified the relationship between consideration and transformational leadership known as individualized consideration.

4.5.1.2 Criticisms of the Ohio State Leadership Studies

Kerr et al., (1974) argued that the Ohio State University studies lacked a conceptual foundation and non-consideration of situational variables. The Ohio State University studies did not clearly identify situations in which the consideration and initiating structure cannot be effectively applied. Moreover, Hackman and Johnson (2013) argued
that the emphasis of the Ohio State study on the use of task and interpersonal styles of leadership communication behaviours are complicated by variations in methodology and instrumentation. Furthermore, they pointed out that the development of several versions of the LBDQ to evaluate consideration and initiating structure items could result to findings that are misleading because of the inconsistency of the LBDQ.

4.5.2 University of Michigan Behavioural Leadership Study

In the 1950s and 1960s, a group of researchers at the University of Michigan investigated leadership behavioural approaches and identified leadership relationships within complex group processes. The central objective of their research was to identify the relationships that exist among leader behaviour, group processes and measure of group performance. They investigated leaders from the insurance, manufacturing and railway sector.

Similarly, Likert (1961) asserted that the Michigan study involved a distribution, collection and analysis of questionnaires and interviews. He also pointed out that the research utilised objective measures of group productivity in order to categorise leaders who were either effective or ineffective. He further revealed that the outcome of the Michigan study was the identification of three types of leadership behaviours that differentiated effective leaders from ineffective leaders (Katz et al., 1950; Likert 1961). These behaviours would be explained below:

1. Task-Oriented Behaviour: Likert (1967) stated that the Michigan study found out the leaders who were effective did not undertake same functions as their subordinates, but were rather involved in task-oriented functions as planning, work scheduling, the coordination of activities and the provision of technical assistance to the group. Therefore, effective leaders were actively engaged in establishing performance goals that were optimal and realistic. Furthermore, Forsyth and Burnette (2010) described a
task-oriented behaviour when a leader focuses on an existing problem by first defining the problem to the group, initiating communication channel through which feedback can be provided as needed in order to solve the problem. They also stated that the situation the leader faces should dictate the kind of effective behaviour to be demonstrated.

2. Relations-Oriented Behaviour: Likert (1967) argued that for leaders to be effective, task-oriented behaviours should be represented. The effective leader utilises relations-oriented behaviour when the leader shows support and sincere concern to help subordinates. Effective leaders exemplify trust, are friendly and caring, seek to understand problems of subordinates, pursue the personal and career development of subordinates and express appreciation and a genuine recognition of subordinates’ contributions. Relations-oriented behaviours can result to high productivity within an organisation because the primary focus of the relation-oriented behaviour of a leader is to promote employee motivation (Katz and Kahn, 1952). Similarly, 43 years later, Bass and Avolio (1995) explained the relations-oriented behaviour as a type of behaviour, which could be evaluated using indicators as idealised attribution, individualised concern, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation.

Further research by Hater and Bass (1998) suggests that followers’ performance increases more with relations-oriented behaviour than task-oriented behaviour. The relations-oriented behaviour enables the effective leader to easily engage followers towards achieving tasks and that the good relationship, leader trust and confidence between leader and follower would motivate followers to achieve even beyond expectations. However, this view was disputed by Jung and Avolio (1999) who argued the followers' performance would be higher under the task-oriented behaviour. They further argue that the task-oriented behaviour by the leader engages team members to
be more innovative and contribute to achieve tasks, which invariably increase their performance.

3. **Participative Leadership Behaviour**: Likert (1967) explained that effective leaders reveal this type of behaviour through group meetings in order to facilitate follower participation in decision-making. The leader engage with the collective team of followers rather than individual team members. Vroom and Yetton (1973) extended this view by proposing that participative leaders are engaged in behaviours that are consultative and group dynamic. Examples of these behaviours include discussing and resolving work problems with followers, requesting for their suggestions and not disregarding their recommendations through the decision-making process after proper evaluation. Yukl (2002) clarified that the effects of participative leadership behaviour to the organisation is that it would boost team cooperation, heighten team spirit and enable effective conflict resolution within the group.

Fernandez (2008) argued that although the Ohio and Michigan studies, were separate studies, their core objective was to ascertain what constituted effective leadership behaviours. He pointed out that the degree to which organisations are consistently evolving brought about the necessity in understanding leadership behaviours that would sustain organisations. However, Hackman and Johnson (2013) argue that modern researchers tend to apply more of the Ohio studies in their empirical research.

Nonetheless, Blake and Mouton (1981) argued that a key limitation of the behavioural approach of leadership as underlined by the Ohio and Michigan studies is their inability to translate the exercise of leadership in more practical terms. To this end, they both developed the Leadership Grid Theory.
4.5.3 Leadership Grid Theory

In 1964, Blake and Mouton initiated a behavioural leadership model which they coined as ‘Leadership Grid’ and also referred to as ‘Managerial Grid’. The objective of the model was to identify five leadership styles that are dependent upon the concern for people and the concern for tasks. Stone, Russell and Patterson (2004), argued that these two factors explain leadership behaviour more effectively. Accordingly, Garza et al., (2015) described the leadership grid as a determinant of behaviours that are inherent across leadership styles and broader perspective to the behavioural approach of leadership. The Leadership Grid was intended to clarify how leaders enable organisations to fulfil their purposes by utilising two factors: concern for people and concern for tasks.

Blake and Mouton (1985) explained further that concern for people involves the approach in which leaders treat employees in organisations who attempt to achieve their goals; while concern for task involves the way in which a leader coordinates organisational tasks. These concerns are evaluated with the use of questionnaire that rates each on a scale of one to nine (Lussier and Achua, 2001). Moreover, Blake and Mouton (1985) showed that leadership grid model involves a combination of concern for tasks and concern for people which consists of two axes that intersect. The vertical axis signifies concern for people while the horizontal axis shows the concern of leaders for tasks. Each axis contains a scale with 9 points, where 1 presents minimum and 9 presents maximum concern. In connecting results of each axis, different leadership styles can be presented. He further clarified the five fundamental leadership styles represented in the Leadership Grid model as illustrated below:

I. **Impoverished**: Blake and Mouton (1985) described this leadership style as one that reflects an impoverished leader whose leadership style is such that he or she
expresses no interest about tasks and relationships. This is a kind of leader who shows no commitment towards the achievement of tasks and has no zeal to establish organisational objectives. The impoverished leader also tends to have no sense of direction which is reflected in the leader’s inability to guide team members.

II. Country Club: Blake and Mouton (1985) argued that this represents a country club leader whose leadership style is implied by a low concern for tasks and production, but a great level of concern for relationships between people. Leaders in this category instil cooperation among team members by promoting a positive work atmosphere. They are also very concerned about employees’ feelings and attitudes as well as the personal and social development of followers. These leaders seek to promote harmony and the avoidance of conflict in the workplace with little attention on production.

III. Authority-Compliance: To Blake and Mouton (1985), this demonstrates leaders that have a high concern for production and a low concern for people. Such leaders view subordinates as a means of productions and motivate staff by driving competition among them. The leader’s focus is not on building relationships, but rather achieving task completion. The leader uses an authoritative approach which centralises control to him or her.

IV. Middle of the road: According to Blake and Mouton (1985), middle of the road management symbolise leaders who reveal a moderate level of concern for both people and tasks. They see the need to have a balance between both levels of concern.

V. Team Leadership: Blake and Mouton (1985) pointed out that this leadership style is represented by leaders who have high concern for people and tasks. These leaders are avid promoters of employee motivation and consistently engage team members in
problem-solving and decision-making processes within the organisation. They also drive team spirit by resolving conflicts immediately as they emerge.

Having explained the Leadership Grid by Blake and Moulton (1985) as described above, Blake and McCanse (1991) stated that although there is no consensus on what the best leadership style is, the most effective leaders are those with maximum concern for tasks and people. There have also been several studies on the Leadership Grid. For example, in 1969, Smith and Honour carried investigated the impact of the Leadership Grid as a management training tool and found that the impact of the training led to a rise in profits and a reduction in controllable costs because of positive changes in attitudes.

Furthermore, Bernardin and Alvares (1976) examined the Leadership Grid as a predictor of conflict resolution methods and leadership effectiveness using a large manufacturing firm as a case study. They found that the Leadership Grid was a poor predictor of perceived leadership effectiveness and conflict resolution methods.

However, after 23 years, Newborough (1999) argued that the Leadership Grid is not just a programme to develop better leaders but maintained that it can also serve as an organisational development tool by identifying the capacity of the Leadership Grid to develop employee relationships, team development and conflict resolution.

More recently, Khan et al., (2015) investigated the relationships between modes of conflict management and the leadership styles of the Leadership Grid in the banking sector of Pakistan. The outcome of the research identified a direct positive correlation between modes of conflict management and leadership styles. It further revealed that most managers in the banking sector implement the team manager style of the Leadership Grid and adopt a collaborative conflict resolution mode in dealing with organisational challenges. However, they criticised the Leadership Grid Theory by
questioning the authenticity of the evidence claiming the effectiveness of the Leadership Grid programs and the viability of the psychometric properties of the Grid instruments.

4.5.4 The Fiedler’s Contingency Theory

Fiedler’s (1951) research involved evaluating the relationship between psychotherapists and patients, and identifying the ways in which similarities and differences in ascribed self-concepts were connected to effectiveness in such interactions. Fiedler (1971) argued that effective leadership is not only a result of a leader’s style but the extent to which a leader can control situations. He identified the need for effective leader-member interactions, task assignment with defined objectives and the leader’s capacity to recognise and punish members where necessary. The major proposition by Fiedler is that leadership does not occur in a vacuum and that to obtain better group performance outcomes, there must be a match between the traits of a leader and situational factors, such as task structure. (Fiedler, 1978). Similarly, Fiedler’s contingency theory suggests that leadership effectiveness is dependent upon the interactions that exist between the leader and situations such a leader encounters (Ellyson et al., 2012). The theory simply suggests that the relationship between a leader’s style and a leader’s effectiveness is dependent upon a leader’s situational control (Fiedler and Garcia, 1987). As a result, Fiedler developed an assessment tool called the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale (LPC) used to measure the cognitive complexity of a leader or assess leadership style (Evans and Dermer, 1974). The LPC is utilised to achieve the main objective of the contingency theory by recognising the link between a leader’s personality and other variables as situational control and influence, and group and organisational performance. The scales that make up the LPC score also evaluate aspects as intelligence and creativity, experience and stress (Miner, 2015).
4.5.4.1 Application of Fiedler’s Contingency Theory

An early study of the Fiedler’s contingency theory was when Ashour in 1973 presented an evaluative analysis of the theory in relation to leadership effectiveness. Having reviewed the theory, he suggested that the examination of the outcomes of situational variables in the theory should include other variables such as group size, activity content, performance cycle, member-member relations and incentive scheme. Similarly, Theodory and Hadbai (1982) examined the Fielder’s approach in Islamic elementary schools in Lebanon. Their primary objective was to determine whether the Fiedler’s contingency theory was applicable in non-western societies. They found that there was no correlation between the principal’s leadership style and teachers' satisfaction. They argued that a probable justification for no correlation between both variables (principal’s leadership style and teacher's satisfaction) could be that within the Islamic educational setting, teachers’ satisfaction is obtained from an internal motivation to serve as instructional pedagogue within a religious framework. The teachers were uninterested by the principal’s leadership style. Theodory and Hadbai (1982) concluded that Fiedler’s Contingency theory was not applicable in non-western societies but applied to western societies with more extrinsic sources of motivation influenced by its individualistic culture. Furthermore, Triandis (1993) tested Fiedler’s Contingency theory from a cross-cultural perspective. He stressed on the significance of paying attention to what the expectations of society are about the roles of power and authority, individual versus collective responsibility, as well as the predictability and control of environment as dictated by the interpretation of situational parameters and the leaders’ behaviour.

Recent studies show the investigation of Fiedler’s contingency theory in the military in the United States of America. For instance, Specht et al., (2011) stated that the reason why conscientiousness is of relevance to job performance is that as military personnel rise to higher positions, they become older and then tend to become more
conscientious in order to sustain job performance. This view was strongly supported with the study of Ellyson et al., (2012) who obtained data from 869 soldiers in order to study on the impact of Fiedler’s Contingency Theory among leadership in the military. They found the applicability of Fiedler’s theory and that conscientiousness was a trait that had the highest influence on job performance in the military.

In their study of effective leadership styles, Sethuraman and Suresh (2014) clarified that Fiedler’s contingency theory is measured by the leadership style and the leader’s work environment. Furthermore, they argue that leadership style is dependent upon the personality styles of a leader while the working environment is established by situational factors which make it possible for leaders to influence their followers.

### 4.5.4.2 Criticisms of Fiedler’s Contingency Theory

Critics question the validity of Fiedler’s contingency theory on empirical and methodological grounds. The empirical evidence supporting Fiedler’s theory has been considered to be inadequate which thereby contests its reliability. For example, Ashour (1973) argued that Fiedler’s contingency theory is a model and not a theory because it has been unable to indicate the behavioural linkages and conceptual explanations that tie group performance outcomes to the independent and moderator variables in the model. Moreover, Ayman et al., (1995) argued that the LPC score was ambiguous and that since it represents an assessment tool created by inductive reasoning, its results cannot provide ideal representation of findings.

Fiedler’s contingency theory has also been criticised for its lack of flexibility because it does not consider the possibility that individuals all have natural leadership styles which are fixed. The LPC measurement does not consider the fact that the least preferred co-worker evaluating the leader may be generally an unfriendly individual who is negligent
of his or her duties or is not willing to be led by any leader at all (Arnone et al., 2012). Moreover, there was an argument that the complexity of the Fiedler's contingency theory was visible in its inability to consider that a leader can demonstrate both dimensions, (i.e. be relationship oriented and task focused) at the same time (Cassidy, 2015).

4.5.5 *Hersey-Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Model*

The development of the theory of situational leadership can be traced to Hersey and Blanchard (1969) who developed the Situational Leadership Model (Watkins, 2001; Fuchs, 2007). They described the model as one whose underlying principle is that the leadership actions are determined by the situation that is before the leader. Therefore, the emphasis of this model is to put into effect the need for leaders to first comprehend given situations and forecast possible outcomes due to the action. Furthermore, Hersey and Blanchard (1969) argued that leadership is complex in that the leader is challenged to solve diverse problems to solve which must be looked into with the needed requirement of the organisation as priority. Similarly, Bass (1990) pointed out that the Situational Leadership model supports the view that in the relationship between leader and followers, no leadership approach could be considered universally effective. Therefore, the effectiveness of a leadership style is dependent upon the situation the leader faces at hand.

Bedford and Gehlert (2013) pointed out that Hersey and Blanchard developed a Situational Leadership model centred on three factors namely: Task Behaviour which reflects the amount of direction the leader provides; Relationship Behaviour which represents the amount of support delivered by the leader; and Readiness Level which is a demonstration of confidence and competence that the follower indicates to the leader.
Early research on situational leadership adopted by the situational leadership model investigated situational leadership in its relationship with the bases of power. Hersey, Blanchard and Natemeyer (1979) maintained that their model could provide an understanding of the possible effects of each power base. They argued that even though leadership styles do not reflect appropriate power base, it may not make best use of the possibility of success. As a result, they identify power bases as a tool with which leaders induce compliance and influence behaviour. These power bases include:

I. **Coercive power:** This represents a power concept that is characterised by fear. A leader who is high in the use of coercive power is viewed as driving compliance and one who ensures that inability to comply is met with punishments such as termination of employment, etc. The advantage of implementing coercive power is that it motivates followers to evade punishment by obeying the leaders and carrying out their required tasks.

II. **Connection power:** This reflects the kind of power that is dependent upon connections with people of influence. A leader who is high in connection power influences compliance because followers seek to benefit from the potent connection of the leader.

III. **Information power:** This concept of power is established by the leader’s ownership of information that is of value to followers. The influence of this power base is evidenced by the premise that followers need the information which the leader has. Information power helps followers to seek information that will improve their job performance.

IV. **Expert power:** This portrays a leader who has expertise and displays a high level of competence and knowledge. This implies that a leader who is high in expert power influences followers’ work behaviour and achieve compliance because followers develop confidence in the leader’s expertise.

V. **Legitimate power:** This concept of power represents the position held by the leader. In other words, the higher the leader’s position, the higher the legitimate power of the
leader. A leader who is high in the use of legitimate power promotes followers’ compliance because the followers believe such leader is right, by reason of the position held.

VI. *Referent power*: This kind of power is centred on the personality traits of the leader. Followers tend to develop an admiration for such leader, which in turn would lead to their compliance as they would want to be positively associated with such leader. This power form is best implemented if a leader is dealing with followers who feel insecure.

VII. *Reward power*: This concept of power is characterised by the leader’s ability to give out rewards to followers. The followers tend to assume that the results of their compliance would reflect in forms of increases in remuneration, benefit packages and other types of recognition. Leaders could gain compliance from followers if the followers have the notion that they reinforce reward power.

Hersey, Blanchard and Natemeyer (1979) conclude that the type of power a leader exercises would only be effective if the leader puts into consideration the situation at hand. Therefore, a situation demands for the adoption of reward power because the followers lack motivation after a hard and complicated task that generated outstanding results work. However, the use of coercive power they argue is not an appropriate power base to be used in such situation.

4.5.5.1 Applications/Studies of the Situational Leadership Model

Silverthorne and Wang (2001) investigated the Situational Leadership style as a predictor of success and productivity among business organisations in Taiwan and found that organisations that were less likely to be adaptive were found to be the most unsuccessful organisations.

Similarly, Avery and Ryan (2002) conducted a study to evaluate the application of situational leadership in Australia and found that although the respondents claimed the
Situational Leadership model to be an effective and simple tool for leadership, they were times when they had been unconscious of their use of the model. The respondents also indicated a high level of confidence they derive in their leadership positions based on their use of the model. As a result, Avery and Ryan (2002) recommended that organisations consistently enable their employees to attend training courses in order to reinforce the manager's commitment to the situational leadership model to enhance their leadership ability.

More recently, Bedford and Gehlert (2013) studied the effects of applying situational leadership to clinical supervision and revealed that applying the Situational Leadership model to clinical supervision would enable the creation of a diagnostic instrument to support supervisors in choosing suitable and applicable interventions in order to supervise effectively. Furthermore, they maintain that the Situational Leadership model provided guidance about when to adjust roles and which roles to adopt based on the needs of the clinical supervisors.

The importance of situational leadership in the workforce was examined by Kaifi et al., (2014) in a study based on gender, place of birth and general affiliation. The results indicated that males had higher situational leadership tendencies than females born in the USA. They argue that the reason for this finding is that masculinist personalities enable males to be sharp and more effective problem solvers in different situations. Interestingly, their study also found out that students not born in the USA, either male or female had higher situational leadership tendencies than US born students.
4.5.5.2 Criticisms of the Situational Leadership Model

The situational leadership model was criticised as being incapable to predict for high-maturity employee and that leadership is still vital for individual at a high degree of follower readiness. Critics also question the predictions of the situational leadership theory by proposing that job performance is not influenced by the degree of match that exists between leadership style and followers’ readiness. Chen and Silverstone (2005) supported the theory’s premise that higher the leader’s leadership score, the higher the influence of the leader, but they disapprove the notion that this predicts job performance.

4.6 Leadership Theory- The Transactional Perspective

Early studies on transactional leadership have been linked to Bass (1985) who described transactional leadership as an involvement of the specific exchanges and a close connection between goals and rewards. A distinguishing feature of transactional leadership is that transactional leaders offer rewards and punishments to enhance performance that makes the relationship between a leader and follower more of an economic transaction. (Bass, 1985). Several studies have linked the transactional leadership theory to the leader–member exchange theory.

4.6.1 Leader-Member Exchange Theory

Dissimilar to traditional theories of leadership that describe leadership as a function of personal attributes and behaviours of the leader, situational variables, or interaction between the two, the Leader Member Exchange (LMX) has incorporated a dyadic relationship as the level of analysis (Graen and Cashman, 1975; Pichler et al., 2015). The fundamental element of the LMX theory upholds that although it emphasizes on the relationship between leader and members, leaders do not interact with members with the same approach (Epitropaki and Martin, 2005).
In analysing the evolution, contributions and future prospects of the LMX construct, Day and Miscenko (2015) argued that the LMX theory was the foremost relational approach to leadership. They also argue that while contemporary leadership theories as servant, authentic and transformational theories focus on the effects of leadership behaviours on employee motivation, attitude and team outcomes, the LMX underlines the quality of relationship as vital in understanding the effects of the leader on followers.

4.6.1.2 Application of the Leader-Member Exchange Theory

Scandura and Graen (1984) conducted an early study of LMX when they sought to answer the question of what would be the outcome if leaders were trained to provide the opportunity to develop a high quality relationship to all followers. They found that those followers who embraced the leader’s offer to develop a high quality LMX immensely enhanced their job performance. Another study by Asgari et al, (2008) investigated the leader-member exchange theory and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). They revealed that leader-member exchange behaviour had a positively significant relationship with organisational citizenship behaviour. Their findings corroborate with the earlier findings of Wayne et al., (2002) which suggested that the higher the quality of LMX relationship, the higher the OCB behaviour in an organisation.

The influence of leader-member exchange LMX on follower engagement has been reported in a recent study by Burch and Gurana (2014) who examined the effects of LMX on the behaviours of followers and how it affects their work attitudes. The findings showed that employees’ relationship with leaders created follower engagement and that follower engagement mediates the relationship between leadership and other significant employee outcomes such as employee turnover intentions and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.
Similarly, Lo et al. (2015) examined the effects of Leader Member Exchange (LMX) theory on organisational performance across a total of 184 financial service companies in Malaysia. They utilised the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to measure the reliability and validity of their results. Their results suggested that the high quality relationship between a leader and follower enhances a better understanding of dyadic issues which makes both parties (that is, the leader and follower) to work at solving these issues in order to improve the performance of the follower. This, they argued, invariably has a positive effect on the overall performance of the organisation. As a result, they recognised a significant influence of LMX on organisational performance and recommend the Leader Member Exchange theory for the financial service industry in Malaysia.

A study by Jansen (2015) evaluated the leader-member exchange theory in relation to work outcomes within the South African telecom industry. The findings revealed that the application of LMX theory in practice could enhance of psychological empowerment due to the high level of engagements between the leaders and workers. As a result, they confirmed that high LMX relationships could be developed through team activities for the call centre agents. Similarly, Olatunde et al., (2015) investigated the effects of LMX theory on job satisfaction and motivation of employees. To achieve this, they gathered responses from 50 employees across two organisations within the same private sector. They examined if the relationship between a leader and team members had a positive correlation to team member’s level of motivation. Their findings indicated a positive association between LMX and employee motivation.

**4.6.1.3 Criticisms of the Leader-Member Exchange Theory**

The LMX theory had been vigorously challenged for its insufficient research of the private sector and the need for a more comprehensive study of organisational outcome
variables that involve leader-member exchanges (Dienesch and Liden, 1986). It has been also criticised for not offering practical advice on how high-quality relationship could be established (Power, 2013). These views corroborate with the objections of the LMX based on the premise that LMX does not provide ways to handle the factors affecting trust such as inequality and unfairness, even though it stresses on the need for trust within leader-follower relationships (Ikonen and Savolainen, 2013).

4.7 Leadership Theory- The Transformational Perspective

Scholars as Gabriel (2013), McCleskey (2014) and Muterera et al., (2015) argue that transformational leadership is the most studied and empirically observed leadership theory in existence.

Earliest research on transformational leadership could be traced to Burns (1978) who speculated that there is a clear differentiation between the transactional perspective of leadership which involves exchange and that of transformational leadership, is that the transforming leader identifies potential motives in followers so as to satisfy their highest needs in order to release their full potential as outcome. Hence, he asserted that the essence of transformational leadership is to “raise the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both”. (Burns, 1978). Avolio and Waldman (1987) symbolise transformational leaders as:

a) Leaders who intensify followers’ consciousness about the significance of selected goals and the means to achieve them.

b) Leaders who encourage followers to go beyond their self-interests and work towards the collective benefit of the organisation, and

c) Leaders who inspire and attend to their followers’ higher order needs through an established mission.
Avolio, Waldman and Yammarino (2007); Sun and Anderson (2012) identified four dimensions of transformational leadership. They are:

i. **Idealized Influence**: This dimension typifies leaders who are receiving admiration, respect and trust from followers that could lead to the follower’s desire to imitate such leader and build close relationships. Bass and Riggio, (2006) suggested that the Idealized Influence is demonstrated when a leader is driven to meet the needs of his or her followers above their own as long as they align with ethical standards of the organisation. Stinglhamber et al., (2015) claimed that the application of idealised influence behaviour within an organisation positively impacts the perceived organisational support (POS) of employees. They argued that employees develop a deeper sense of support when they discern that their leaders are sincerely driven to meet their needs.

ii. **Inspirational Motivation**: Moriano et al, (2014) describe this dimension which reflects how a leader initiates and expresses a vision of the future in such a way that captivates the followers. A clear indication of a leader’s enthusiasm and positivity should be represented under this dimension.

iii. **Intellectual Stimulation**: Eisenbeiß and Boerner (2013) defined intellectual stimulation as the encouragement which leaders extend to followers. They argue that the motivation behind this level of encouragement is to enhance followers’ ability to challenge existing assumptions, redefine problems and seek for solutions with an innovative mind-set. They identified intellectual stimulation as an element of behaviour which has a positive relationship with followers’ creativity within the organisation.
iv.  **Individualized Consideration:** According to Van Knippenberg and Sithkin (2013), individualized consideration involves the leaders’ recognition of the diverse needs of followers and his ability to offer individualized attention, coaching and mentoring. They also suggested that there is a positive overlap between Conger and Kanungo’s (1998) dimension of sensitivity to follower needs and individualized consideration.

**4.7.1.2 Application of Transformational Leadership Theory**

Jung and Sosik (2002) explored the effects of transformational leadership on perceived group performance in four large South Korean establishments. They found that transformational leadership promotes the effectiveness of a group because it empowers followers to act independently, yet collaboratively in achieving the overall objectives of the group.

Rowold (2005) indicated that the most common instrument for evaluating transformational leadership within an organisation is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) which was initiated by Burns (Burns, 1978), and advanced by Bass and Avolio (Bass and Avolio, 2004). Moreover, Judge and Piccolo (2004) pointed out that the MLQ is a standard tool for assessing a transformational, non-leadership and transactional scales by analysing behaviours.

Aydogdu and Asikgil (2011) carried out an analysis of the impact of transformational leadership behaviours on organisational culture in Turkey and found a positive relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and aspects of national culture which such as long term orientation, individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Similarly, Forka (2012) conducted a study of transformational leadership in sub-Saharan Africa, by utilising the perceived application of transformational leadership principles in Cameroon.
through examining follower’s perspectives. His study showed that there was a high absence of transformational leadership in practice due to ineffective leadership.

Moreover, Al-Abrow (2013) investigated the kind of influence that the transformational leadership approach had on organisational performance in the public health sector in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and found that there was a positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational performance, and that this relationship was controlled by organisational learning and intellectual capital.

In another study, Ejere and Abasilim (2013) explored the impact of transformational and transactional leadership styles on organisational performance from a Nigerian perspective and found that a combination of transformational and transactional leadership styles that would have the highest impact on organisational performance. A study by May et al., (2014) found individualized consideration as the highest effect on employees’ preference to work. They argued that the more employees benefit from a leader’s application of individualized consideration, the highest tendency for an increased job satisfaction. Also, Amin et al., (2015) investigated the three leadership styles (Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-faire) demonstrated by principals and divisional directors of a public university in Pakistan using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, and found that leaders displayed transformational leadership more than the others. A study by Qu et al., (2015) in Mainland China revealed that inspirational motivation makes followers believe in the leader’s mission, values and expectations. Their finding reinforce Bass and Stogdill’s (1990) view that a leader’s inspirational motivation is reflected in manner with which followers accept such a leader’s aspiration.
4.7.1.3 Criticisms of Transformational Leadership Theory

Critics as Northouse, (1997); McLaurin and Al Amri, (2008) question the transformational leadership theory for being void of conceptual clarity, deals with leadership from a personality trait perspective, derives its basis from qualitative data, and represents an elitist and antidemocratic approach with the tendency to be used for abuse. Also, transformational leadership theory has been strongly challenged for having ambiguous constructs, inadequate information of explanatory processes, exclusion of some significant behaviours, insufficient specification of limiting conditions and a bias towards heroic conceptions of leadership (Pilbeam et al., 2016).

Furthermore, the theory has been contested as one without clarity on how leaders can shape groups and processes within an organisation (Paulsen et al., 2013). The major instrument of transformational leadership theory known as Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was criticised by (Lievens et al., 1997; Knippenberg and Sithkin, 2013) for having weak measurement properties which could misinform findings. To support this view, Fadare (2013) identified difficulties in measurement related to the application of transformational leadership after understudying the pre-colonial leadership of Nigeria. For example, he argued that although transformational leaders as Herbert Macaulay was notable in Nigeria for his avid zeal to see Nigeria obtain independence from British colonial rule, how could he be effectively measured as a transformational leader?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Leadership Theory</th>
<th>Definition (s)</th>
<th>Application/Major Findings</th>
<th>Criticisms</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Trait Leadership  | An integrated pattern of personal characteristics that are indicators of individual differences which should drive leader effectiveness of a given group or society. | The development of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator by Isabel Myer and Katherine Briggs based on their assessment of the work of Carl Jung on personality. The Myer-Briggs personality type indicator (MBTI) as an instrument to evaluate those traits that an effective project manager should have and found that certain competencies such as achievement and action, helping and human service, impact and influence, managerial cognitive | I. The trait theory failed to recognise the possibility of differences in situation that may influence a leader’s action. The presupposition of the trait theory that certain leaders behave a particular way, fails to take cognizance of the fact that change in situations directly influence the behaviour of the leader.  
II. The debate is that if personality tests are used to evaluate traits, then it becomes questionable as to how effective these tests | Hogan, DeSoto and Solano (1977); Zaccaro, Kemp and Bader (2004); Gehring (2007); and Matthews (2015). |
| 2 | **Autocratic/Directive Leadership** | The leadership process in which decision making and is exemplified where the power to direct is centralised to an individual dominant leader. It is an approach in which the core qualities of the leader imply that all essential decisions are made by the leaders. | i. African organisations were in nature bureaucratic, hierarchical with a one-way communication process primarily from the top to the bottom.  
ii. Leadership styles in African modern organisations is demonstrated through high level centralized power structures, focus on control mechanisms, a lot of uncertainty instead of an emphasis on organisational performance and the acceptance of positive | I. Tendency to drive high turnover rates of followers, a tendency for employee to become less innovative, reduced follower motivation and morale, low job satisfaction and low organisational loyalty  
II. Tendency for an autocratic leader to develop narcissistic behaviours than other participatory leadership styles. | Kiggundu, Jørøsen and Halsi (1983); Blunt and Jones (1997); Beugre (1998); Burns (2004); Bass and Bass (2009); De Hoogh, Greer and Den Hartog (2015); and Nevicka et al., 2018 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Democratic or Participative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The outcome of three functions namely: distribution of responsibility, empowerment of team members and aiding deliberation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. After examining the effects of leadership on a firm’s financial performance in Ghana, there is evidence that though no leadership style significantly predicted the financial performance of the two banks, the democratic style accounted for more variance.

ii. Employees’ perceived democratic leadership will experience positive quality of work life than autocratic leadership style in private and public sector organisations in Ekiti State, Nigeria.

The drive for the democratic leader to reach a consensus could be problematic in situations that require immediate decision-making.

Whitehead (1936); Lewin et al., (1939); Yankelovich (1991); Gastil (1994); Khan et al., 2015)
<p>|   | Laissez-Faire Leadership | Laissez-faire leadership exemplified by a neglect of supervisory functions and lack of guidance to subordinates. The paradox of laissez-faire leadership is that it indicates the absence of leadership and a behaviour of a leader who abdicates his or her authority. | I. After examination of a boys’ club led by adults displaying either the laissez-faire or democratic leadership style to determine their effects, it was found that the team led with the laissez-faire leadership approach was in a disorderly state, their work output was of poor quality, and their productivity remained ineffective. II. Following the investigation of leadership styles of principals in relation to teachers’ job performance in senior secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria, findings revealed that | Lewin et al., (1939); Bradford and Lippitt (1945); Adeyemi (2010) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Behavioural Leadership Theories/Studies</th>
<th></th>
<th>teachers’ job performance was less effective in schools that practised laissez-faire leadership.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ohio State University Study</td>
<td>The Ohio State University research group coordinated by Carroll Shartle brought psychologists and researchers together in the 1950s with the main objective of identifying behavioural indicators of effective leadership that could apply to leaders universally. The Ohio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hemphill (1949); and Hemphill and Coons, (1957);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   |   |   |   |
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State University study commenced with the development of a questionnaire designed to evaluate diverse leadership behaviours in organisations. The questionnaire was initiated by Hemphill in 1949 with the collection of over 1,800 items that defined leadership behaviours. These 150 statements, which were used to produce a questionnaire known as the Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). 

Initiating structure items could result to findings that are misleading because of the inconsistency of the LBDQ.
In the 1950s and 1960s, a group of researchers at the University of Michigan investigated leadership behavioural approaches and identified leadership relationships within complex group processes. The central objective of their research was to identify the relationships that exist among leader behaviour, group processes and measure of group performance. They investigated leaders from the insurance, manufacturing and railway sector.
| 7 | The Fiedler's Contingency Theory | The major proposition by Fiedler is that leadership does not occur in a vacuum and that to obtain better group performance outcomes, there must be a match between the traits of a leader and situational factors, such as task structure. | An early study of the Fiedler’s contingency theory was when Ashour in 1973 presented an evaluative analysis of the theory in relation to leadership effectiveness. Having reviewed the theory, he suggested that the examination of the outcomes of situational variables in the theory should include other variables such as group size, activity content, performance cycle, member-member relations and incentive scheme. | Critics question the validity of Fiedler’s contingency theory on empirical and methodological grounds. The empirical evidence supporting Fiedler’s theory has been considered to be inadequate which thereby contests its reliability. | Ashour (1973); and Fiedler, (1978); |
|   | Hersey-Blanchard's Situational Leadership Model | It’s underlying principle is that the leadership actions are determined by the situation that is before the leader. The identification of power bases as a tool with which leaders induce compliance and influence behaviour. These power bases include: Coercive power, Connection power, Information power, Expert power, Legitimate power, just to mention a few. | Situational Leadership style was found to be a predictor of success and productivity among business organisations in Taiwan. It was also found that organisations that were less likely to be adaptive were found to be the most unsuccessful organisations. | I. Incapable to predict for high-maturity employee and that leadership is still vital for individual at a high degree of follower readiness.  
II. The predictions of the situational leadership theory by proposing that job performance is not influenced by the degree of match that exists between leadership style and followers’ readiness | Hersey and Blanchard (1969); Watkins, (2001); Silverthorne and Wang (2001); and Fuchs, (2007); |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Leadership Theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange Theory</td>
<td>The fundamental element of the LMX theory upholds that although it emphasizes on the relationship between leader and members, leaders do not interact with members with the same approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Leader-member exchange theory had a positively significant relationship with organisational citizenship behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Relationship with leaders created follower engagement and that follower engagement mediates the relationship between leadership and other significant employee outcomes such as employee turnover intentions and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The LMX theory had been vigorously challenged for its insufficient research of the private sector and the need for a more comprehensive study of organisational outcome variables that involve leader-member exchanges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dienesch and Liden, (1986); Epitropaki and Martin, 2005; Asgari et al., (2008); and Burch and Gurana (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | Transformational Leadership | The essence of transformational leadership is to "raise the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both". Transformational leaders can be symbolised as transformational leaders as:

d) Leaders who intensify followers' consciousness about the significance of selected goals. | After investigating the kind of influence that the transformational leadership approach had on organisational performance in the public health sector in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), it was found that there was a positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational performance, and that this relationship was controlled by organisational learning and intellectual capital. | Transformational leadership has been questioned for having ambiguous constructs, inadequate information of explanatory processes, exclusion of some significant behaviours, insufficient specification of limiting conditions and a bias towards heroic conceptions of leadership. |

Burns (1978); Avolio and Waldman (1987); Al-Abrrow (2013); and (Pilbeam et al., 2016). |
and the means to achieve them.

e) Leaders who encourage followers to go beyond their self-interests and work towards the collective benefit of the organisation, and

f) Inspire and attend to their followers’ higher order needs through an established mission.
4.8 Justification/Conclusion of this chapter

Research into leadership has a long history. For this reason, academic literature on leadership has revealed the emergence of several contrasting themes. These themes have been represented here as theories have revealed divergent schools of thought on the leadership phenomenon, as it appears to consistently evolve in relation to organisational practice. Based upon the premise that servant leadership is not only a more recent leadership theory, but the primary focus of this research, it was important to explore several investigations of the theories looked at in this chapter, and share relevant findings. Having explained several applications and criticisms of leadership theories, it has provided a good foundation in exploring servant leadership, which would be further evidenced in the next chapter.
Chapter Five: Leadership – *the servant perspective*.

Since the third chapter explored the concept of Servant Leadership by looking at its background/origin, definitions, characteristics, values and attributes, this chapter focuses on the application and criticisms of Servant-Leadership with the aim of developing a theoretical framework for this study. It will explore the phenomenon of leadership and culture that will lead to a discussion on Ubuntu, which reflects Africa’s culture of leadership. In conclusion, it will present a theoretical framework that summarises the literature of servant leadership and would link the framework to developed hypotheses which would be tested.

Just to recap, Servant Leadership has been defined by the founder of the concept Greenleaf (1977, p.4) as:

“The Servant-Leader is servant first….It begins with a natural feeling that one wants to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead...The best test, and difficult to administer is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in the society? Will they benefit, or at least not further be harmed?”

Moreover, Greenleaf (1977) stated that Servant Leadership is a leadership process in which there is a genuine concern of the leader towards the follower. This concern brings about serving and leading the followers at the same time. In Greenleaf’s (1977) investigation of the nature of legitimate power and greatness, he pointed out that Servant Leadership should be observed beyond its application as a management technique but also a way of life which commences with “the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first” (Greenleaf, 1977, pp. 13-14).
Similarly, in viewing servant leadership as a way of life, researchers as Graham (1991); Carroll and Patterson (2016) argued that servant leadership involves serving multiple stakeholders which included society. While expanding the scope of beneficiaries to servant leadership practice, he emphasised that the way of life of the servant leader is to ensure that the followers’ highest priority needs are met. However, further perspectives on what servant leadership have emerged. Spears (1996) argued that servant leadership can be defined as a new leadership model that places serving others as dominant priority and is characterised through listening, empathy, emotional healing, persuasion, awareness, foresight, conceptualization, stewardship, growth and community building.

5.1.1 Application of Servant Leadership

It is almost common knowledge that the organisation that is notable for practical application of servant leadership is Southwest Airlines in the United States of America. Gittell (2003) presented results from an extensive exploratory study on Southwest Airlines. The overarching rationale behind the study was to determine how Southwest Airlines uses the power of relationships to attain high performance. The study identified some major milestones of Southwest Airlines which included standing out as a profitable airline since 1972 even at periods of uncertainty within the airline industry. Remarkably, in 2002, Southwest Airlines achieved a market capitalisation of $9 billion which surpassed the market capitalisation of every other US airline combined. Also, Southwest Airlines had consistently being rated among the “100 Best Companies to Work for in America” by Fortune Magazine. Gittell’s (2003) study attributed the leadership approach within the aviation industry as critical to its overall success. The source of the organisation’s high level performance is the leadership style that initiated shared goals between leadership and followers, shared knowledge which promotes
work coordination and promotes innovation, mutual respect within the entire organisation, consistent and appropriate communication; and huge investment in frontline leaders.

Therefore, Gittell (2003) argued that since Southwest Airlines saw their leaders and supervisors as important to their growth, one of their major goals is to develop effective frontline leaders and have enough leaders to work alongside other employees. Southwest airlines also had a culture of teaching their leaders on how to provide coaching and feedback to the employees.

The practices above are core elements of servant leadership. Further studies of servant leadership have covered cases from all continents of the globe. For example, Anderson (2005) presented a correlational analysis of servant-leadership and job satisfaction in a religious educational institution owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the USA. The aim of the research was to find parallels of the relationship between high and low cadre perceptions of servant-leadership principles practised in the institution and their influence on job satisfaction. It deployed the use of a mixed research method, thereby using the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) quantitative instrument for a randomly selected sample of teachers and qualitative interviews for administrators. The findings of the study showed a significant relationship between self-perceptions of servant-leadership and employee job satisfaction.

Similarly, Van Tassell (2006) examined the perceptions of servant-leadership in relation to job satisfaction at a Franciscan-owned university in the USA. This study was crucial to the university considering the fact that it had just changed its president of 27 years. It served as an avenue to appraise the new leadership style at the university and to find out, if it was servant leadership. The findings showed that attributes of servant-
leadership such as awareness, listening, commitment to the growth of people and foresight, and empathy were perceivable in the university. As a result, employees related these servant leadership attributes exemplified by the president as significant factors that have increased their perceived job satisfaction. The new president of the university was a community builder who honestly desired that employees obtained a high job satisfaction. He created more avenues within the university for employees to express themselves and be more innovative in their job functions. Even though, the past president was successful in the effective management of the university and was a democratic leader, Van Tassell (2006) pointed out that his lack of servant leadership attributes such as foresight and commitment to the growth of employees may have been the reason why, employees perceived him more as a functional manager than a leader.

Furthermore, Hofmann (2007), investigated how servant leadership enhances job satisfaction and decreases employee turnover at Islamic institutions. They explained that there was a high possibility of promoting servant-leadership practise in Muslim institutions, by ascribing its similarity to Islam’s *shura* which is a management style that is based on collective decision making.

Similarly, Salie (2008) carried an analysis of the relationship between servant leadership and work satisfaction in Islamic organisations in South Michigan, USA. He debated that there was limited research on the area of leadership within Muslim institutions in the USA, and that there was a necessity to provide the Muslim community with techniques on how to sustain their institutions. As a result, upon collecting data from over 271 participants, the results showed that specific elements of servant-leadership which include: effective communication, delegation and empowerment, leader trust and motivation were crucial to job satisfaction. Therefore, Sallie (2008)
argued that Muslim administrators and managers were not exempt from developing effective leadership traits.

Also, Chavez (2011) carried out a study of the long-term effects of a founding servant leader on two educational institutions in Bolivia, namely *Universidad Evangelica Boliviana* and *the Rio Nuevo Educational Society*. The two educational organisations in Santa Cruz, Bolivia, were founded by Dr Scheflen whom Chavez (2011) claimed to have been a servant-leader and an individual who inspired servant leadership principles across the learning institutions. The principal focus of the research was to determine if the practise of servant leadership, as established by the founder, who was cross-cultural and no longer leading, was preserved within the organisations, bringing into consideration the influence of the Bolivian culture.

Therefore, Chavez (2011) argued that the rationale behind selecting a phenomenological method to study the inquiry was to generate clear perspectives emanating from employee’s experiences and perceptions. The feedback from the study gathered with the use of the OLA (Organisational Leadership Assessment) instrument and data from interviews revealed the existence of servant-leadership behaviours within both institutions. However, he stated that remarkable differences between both organisations which propose that servant-leadership and trust are apparent despite the low moralistic culture of trust and the individual dyadic leader. Therefore, he argued that leader follower relationships remain subject to strategic, relational or trust judgements.

Using the Vrije Universiteit Medical Center as a case study, De Waal and Sivro (2012) they gathered responses from over 116 managers and employees to explain the extent of relationship that existed between servant-leadership and organisational performance and a high-performance organisation (HPO). To bring in more clarity to their investigation, a High-Performance Organisation (HPO) was described as an
organisation that achieves better financial and non-financial results than its competitors over a time span of 5 to 10 years. The outcomes of their analysis revealed that there was no evidence of a direct positive correlation between servant-leadership and organisational performance. Although, there was indication of servant leadership having an effect on the HPO framework, this effect was dissimilar on several organisational levels. Therefore, they concluded that there was inconsistency in the role of servant-leadership in the organisation studied.

A study by Harwiki (2013) on the influence of servant-leadership on organisational culture, organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and employees’ performance in the East Java Province of Indonesia. He found that servant-leadership had a very high influence on organisational culture and employee performance, but not organisational citizenship behaviour. The study also showed that servant leadership was a leadership approach that easily motivates employees to undertake their job functions more effectively, which in turn had a positive impact on the organisation thereby increasing employees’ performance.

A recent study was by Das et al., (2014) of the private and public sector companies in India, with the aim of finding out whether there was an intrinsic or unequivocal existence of the servant leadership construct among Indian business managers. To achieve this, their research investigated the servant leadership profiles of Indian managers alongside their demographic profiles and examined the difference between the private and public sector in line with their servant leadership profiles as well as the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction. The results showed that there was no major significant difference between the private and public sector companies as it relates to their servant leadership profiles. They stated that although the servant leadership concept is new in India, but the practice of servant leadership was inherent among Indian managers because it reflected key aspects of the Indian culture centred on
solidarity and the need for communal growth. Their findings revealed that servant leadership would have a positive impact in Indian organisations and calls for Indian organisations to cultivate the servant leadership theory because it reflects the humane-oriented aspects of the Indian culture and would enhance motivation that drives employees to improved job satisfaction.

Similarly, a study by Carter and Baghurst (2014) explored the influence of servant-leadership on employee engagement in Celebration Restaurant in Dallas, USA. This restaurant was a company that had incorporated servant-leadership training into their recruitment and employee development strategy programs. Carter and Baghurst (2014) observed that a further demonstration of the company’s zeal to effectively apply servant-leadership could be seen at regular learning and discussion sessions in an effort to develop servant-leadership traits and apply its principles. The key findings of their investigation showed that employees had developed personal bonds with the company due to the peer-to-peer relationships that servant-leadership inspired. In addition, employees’ perceptions indicated that they felt a high sense of value from the company and were remarkably driven towards delivering exceptional customer service and contribute optimal results to the company. The majority of the employees believed that servant leadership was making their company more effective.

A recent study is by Mahembe and Engelbrecht (2014) analysed the relationships between Servant-Leadership, Organisational Citizenship Behaviour and School Team Effectiveness, using the South African school system as case study. They found a significant positive association between servant-leadership and team effectiveness and moderate relationship between servant-leadership and organisational citizenship behaviour. Hence, they propose the use of servant-leadership in the South African school system and argued that if principals offer service to school teams, recognise and
nourish the talents of teachers, the teachers would in turn commit to achieving better effectiveness for the school.

Similarly, a more recent study by Giolito and Van Dierendonck (2015) investigated the role of servant leadership on organisational performance and the well-being of employees. In doing this, they suggested servant leadership to denote a paradox, in that it encourages leaders to attend to the needs of their followers before their own self-interests, even to the potential loss of organisational goals. This opinion is supported by Gristaffe et al., (2016) who illustrated servant leadership to be a needed leadership style for sales driven business organisations. This was the result of their investigation to ascertain the kind of leadership approaches that would facilitate a sales person’s productivity.

However Chiniara and Bentein (2016), argue that despite the various descriptions of servant leadership and its relationship with variables as employee task performance and OCBs (Organisational Citizenship Behaviours), there is little knowledge that explains the link between such variable and servant leadership. They argue that a mechanism which provides such understanding would bring more clarity to the explanation of the concept of servant leadership.

To conclude this section, the literature identifies the significant effects of servant leadership on job satisfaction, leader effectiveness, organisational citizenship behaviour and organisational culture. However, it strongly reveals the prevalence of servant leadership in westernised cultures as compared to non-western societies. However, in the case of the leadership theories aforementioned, the servant-leadership theory has also faced criticisms based on diverse reasoning. The following are some of the criticisms.

5.1.1.2 Criticisms of Servant Leadership Theory
There are strong claims that if servant-leadership was applied in a work organisation in which individuals had been used to authoritative forms of leadership, the approach would not be effective (Tatum, 1995). Extending this view was a statement by Anderson (2005, p.17), who stated that “It is important to understand that there is nothing inherently “better” or “higher” about this kind of leadership. Too often, the literature on the subject takes a moralistic tone and leaves people with the impression that participation is next to godliness, when in fact it is simply a different tool for a different task”.

Moreover, Robert Greenleaf has been referred to as a Don Quixote trying to convince managers to pursue good and eschew evil. Servant leadership has been challenged as a moralistic yet impracticable leadership perspective (Quay, 1997). This view is supported by Brumback (1999) who argued that the servant-leadership theory consisted of ideas that were incomprehensible and unusable. In further support of this claim, Bowie (2000) noted that servant-leadership represent a naïve, passive and unrealistic leadership approach.

Russell and Stone (2002) raised the need for servant leadership research to justify the effect of the leadership approach with organisational frameworks because the approach was devoid of adequate scientific evidence to validate its prevalent acceptance. Similarly, Anderson (2009) argued that the servant leadership theory does not have a universally accepted measurement instrument, while recognising the fact that this gap is common with all the other leadership theories. He also expressed the lack of clarity as to whether servant-leadership was comprehended as a set of behaviours or a philosophy based upon personality. In addition, Anderson (2009) stated that there was a need to further establish the positive effects of servant-leadership towards meeting the outcomes of organisations, and for a clearer distinction between servant-leaders and non-servant leaders.
Servant leadership theory has been also criticised by Smith, Montagno and Kuzmenko (2004) as a leadership style that may not be effective in a fast paced working environment like a large factory. However, they recommended the servant leadership style in a more fixed business environment with firm external context. This is despite the counter-argument that the application of servant leadership would add to the moral and ethical behaviour of employees in any organisational setting and as a result promote positive behaviour on both micro and macro levels.

5.2 Ubuntu Leadership Theory - An African Perspective

According to Mangaliso (2001, p. 24)

“Ubuntu can be defined as humaneness – a pervasive spirit of caring and community, harmony and hospitality, respect and responsiveness – that individuals and groups display for one another. Ubuntu is the foundation for the basic values that manifest themselves in the ways African people think and behave towards each other and everyone else they encounter”.

Similarly, Karsten and Illa (2005) argued that Ubuntu represents an African perspective of the world which is fortified in its own person, society and culture and could be difficult to describe through a Westernised context. This view was strongly supported by Bekker (2007) who maintained that there exists an urgent need in Africa for a local, inventive and values-based leadership approach. He further suggested that the Ubuntu philosophy represents such approach, even as it helps to create better understanding of the relationship between leaders and followers by emphasising on harmony and continuity.

Although Van Binsbergen (2001), Newenham-Kahindi (2009) and Taylor (2014) neither attribute the coinage of the term “Ubuntu” nor the development of the theory to a particular individual, they agree that the terminology “Ubuntu” is derived from the Bantu Nguni languages of Xhosa, Zulu, Ndebele and Swati. They also stated that Ubuntu has become widespread in Sub-Saharan Africa and an ideology used to reflect Africa’s
values and culture. Newenham-Kahindi (2007; 2009) argued that although Ubuntu is a prevalent African philosophy, it is termed differently across Africa. For instance, the people of Herero in Namibia refer to it as Avandu, the Sesotho tribe in Southern Africa utilise the word Batho, Swahili tribe in East Africa make use of the word Watu, and Bantu in Tanzania. In Central parts of Africa, words such as Kubuntu, Edubuntu and Ngumtu are used to refer to the Ubuntu philosophy; stressing the significance of togetherness.

According to Khoza (2006), the origin of Ubuntu can be related to the African conception of being. He argued that the orthodox notion of the beginning of life is that Umvelingqangi (in IsiZulu) or Nkhubyani (in Xitsonga) formed human kind from need. The implication of this is that since all humans have a common foundation, we must by this very fact fit together. This view upholds that the individual is enmeshed into the collective, while still holding an identity as a realistic being. A universal expression of Ubuntu across Africa is umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu which implies that an individual’s existence is defined by the existence of other individuals (Nkondo, 2007).

In looking at Ubuntu from a leadership perspective, Malunga (2009) stressed that the principle of Ubuntu requires the leader to become a role model. The leader’s role is legitimised by his or her demonstration of key African values. These values include sincerity, solidarity, protection of each other’s interest, empathy, compassion, honesty, respect for others and dignity. However, he explained that the abandonment of these traditional humanistic leadership value systems is closely linked to the development of leadership practices enforced in Africa through colonialist rule. This led to the emergence of inflexible power structures implemented through colonial rule. Taylor (2014) argued that whether Ubuntu is looked at philosophically or ethically, it defines the conduct of relationship between an interactive collection of people which could involve leaders and followers. A descriptive analysis of such conduct in relationship could be
best represented by a framework. There is an Ubuntu leadership framework developed by Ncube (2010) which reinforces key principles of Ubuntu leadership in practice. They are highlighted as follows:

\textit{i. Communal Enterprise and a Shared Vision}: Ncube (2010) explained that the framework for Ubuntu leadership is necessitated by the leader having to inspire a shared vision and developing a futuristic vision which provides others with direction. Under this framework, group outcomes become more significant than individual goals.

\textit{ii. Interconnectedness, Interdependency and Empowerment}: Owusu et al., (2015) assert that vital component of Ubuntu is the togetherness and interdependence it represents. They argue that the Ubuntu leader empowers followers and directly enables the followers to develop a higher sense of trust and confidence in their abilities.

\textit{iii. Collectivism and Solidarity}: Ncube (2010, p.8) stated that “\textit{Ubuntu will show a way to work together and will create a rainbow mentality in our organisations characterised by a high degree of cultural, religious, tribal, racial and political tolerance}”. Also, Govender (2014) pointed out that Ubuntu originates from the ancient philosophy of humanism and has the idea of collectivism as its foundation. This element of the Ubuntu principle was further strengthened by Sarpong, Bi and Amankwah-Amoah (2016) who pointed out that the socio-culture component of Africa is largely collectivist, and this enables the Ubuntu leader to foster greater teamwork within an organisation.

Therefore it can be concluded that Ubuntu is described as Africa’s philosophy of life and its perspective on leadership informed by its set of cultural values and norms. The next section would review a number of studies of the Ubuntu leadership theory.

\textbf{5.2.1 Application of the Ubuntu Leadership Theory}
Dalitso (2010) investigated the practicability of using Ubuntu as a cultural strategy for organisational development and change in Sub-Saharan Africa. He analysed the kind of interaction that exists between Ubuntu and organisational development by looking at humanistic values such as solidarity, sharing and respect and found that Ubuntu had a positive relationship to organisational development by serving as a strategic cultural integrator within an organisation.

In this context, Bertsch (2012) explored how the collective potential of Ubuntu leadership could be functional to American leadership theory and practice. He commenced his study by investigating some gaps in the construct of American leadership. Firstly, he argued that a lot of research has focused on American leadership practices as the most effective leadership practices without taking cognizance of the fact that we live in a multicultural world and cultural differences must be put into consideration. He proposed that an appropriate comprehension of Ubuntu is that upholds the idea that ‘Ego’ gets in the way of good leadership. This, he ascribed, reflected the American models of leadership in which the leader seeks recognition, is glorified and is always on the spotlight.

However, Bertsch (2012) pointed out that the self-awareness and self-assurance elements of servant-leadership could be used to better understand Ubuntu. Based on this, he proposed that the use of characteristics of Ubuntu as a spirit of solidarity, compassion, respect, dignity and survival in the American leadership context could transform the ethical decision making dilemma facing many American-based establishments. He further emphasised that for Ubuntu leadership dimensions to make impact within the American organisational culture, there is a need for American-based organisations to relook their value-systems.
A study was carried out by Brubaker (2013) to clarify the kind of relationships that existed between Servant-Leadership, Ubuntu, and Leader Effectiveness in Rwanda. The participants of the inquiry consisted of employees working in the private sectors of the Rwandan economy. The findings of the study specified that from a Rwandan private sector context, servant-leadership had a significant and positive relationship to leader effectiveness. It also showed that servant-leadership and Ubuntu are two leadership models that are not significantly different in the strength of their relationships with leader effectiveness.

Naicker (2015) investigated the Ubuntu leadership perspective in relation to the education sector in South Africa. The principal aim of the enquiry was to ascertain how school principals could practically apply the values of the Ubuntu philosophy in their interactions with teachers. The findings recommended that practical ways in which Ubuntu can be demonstrated in the principal-teacher relationship include: the principals becoming role models, valuing diversity, the display of empathy and sympathy to the challenges teachers encountered and more engagement of teachers into leadership practice.

Similarly, Msila (2016) examined how Ubuntu leadership could sustain educational institutions in South Africa. He argued that the reliance of Western frameworks in educational management could be counter-productive to leadership development in the education sector in Africa. For this reason, he suggested the need for educational institutions in Africa to facilitate their leadership development learning programmes with the use of African models. Bringing Ubuntu into context, he quoted Bush and Anderson (2003) who asserted that “Cultural models focus on values, beliefs, and norms of individuals in the organisation and how these individual perceptions coalesce into shared organisational meanings. Cultural models therefore, are manifested by symbols and rituals rather than through the formal structure of the organisation” (Msil, 2016,
p.142). As a result, he recommends that the principles of Ubuntu be incorporated into leadership practice in educational institutions in Africa and suggested the need for leader-follower relationships to resemble the village and the cultural expectations by the village of the king.

5.2.1.2 Criticisms of the Ubuntu Leadership Theory

Shutte (2001) criticised the Ubuntu leadership theory by questioning its assumption that “I only become fully human to the extent that I am included in relationships with others” (p. 21), which he argued seems to affirm commitment to the group at the expense of the rights of the individual. Similarly, Cornell (2000) argued that Ubuntu leadership as a representation of a collective ethic rejects the significance of individual autonomy. Therefore, he further criticises the Ubuntu ideology as one which does not promote the kind of creativity that is derived from individuality.

Uncertainty has been expressed by Hailey (2008) as to whether Ubuntu could be applied universally across cultures. This criticism emanates from the argument that while a few researchers have identified the effectiveness of Ubuntu leadership across all cultures, they do not inform on practical measurements of implementing and validating the reliability of Ubuntu if practised. Similarly, Dalitso (2010) questioned Ubuntu leadership theory as being vague and open to numerous representations, which could be confusing. Following this, Dalitso (2010) indicated the tendency for the Ubuntu philosophy to appear complex, he maintained its symbolism in representing inclusiveness and responsibility for others.

Similarly, critics share the viewpoint that a major weakness of Ubuntu is the fact that it is not conceptually established upon a solid framework which is backed up by empirical justifications. However, they also point to the fact that other generally accepted theories as democracy, although not universally applied have gained positive acceptance in
many parts of society. They conclude by suggesting that Ubuntu values have the tendency to weaken societies citing that the Ubuntu value of respect for authority and openness to new ideas may have served as a contributory factor to colonisation that Africa witnessed which in turn gave rise to marginalisation, culture erosion and absolute external dependence (Mugumbate and Nyanguru, 2013).

Ubuntu has been argued to refute humanity to non-autochthonous individuals. Ubuntu leadership theory is claimed to have a tendency to enact revivalism. Revivalism in their context, captures the ideal of seeking the narrative of return as fundamentally inherent in the quest to recreate an otherwise obsolete type of being. Another debate they enlighten upon is the assumption that not all Africans may have the same views of Ubuntu (Matolino and Kwindingwi, 2013).

As previously stated, the semblance between Ubuntu leadership and servant-leadership only reflects how important culture is to this study. There is complexity in defining leadership and culture universally (Bass 1990; Dorfman and House, 2004). Therefore, the next section describes the synthesis and evaluation of culture and leadership in such a way that meets the objectives of this study.

5.3 Leadership and Culture

Early attempts to define culture suggest that the word culture was derived from the Latin verb *culturare* as its original roots show the amalgamation of the histories of “cult” and “cultivate” (Jewel and Abate’s *New Oxford American Dictionary, 2001*, p. 416). The concept keeps advancing in scholarly explanations and has become an important indicator of social reality (Baldwin et al., 2006). What then is culture? Having reviewed over 150 definitions of culture from diverse disciplines, Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952, *p. 181*). stated:
“Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiment in artefacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other, as elements of further action”.

Since this traditional definition of culture was articulated, many scholars have given their perspectives on culture. For example, Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (1993) in their book, the Seven Cultures of Capitalism described culture as been relative to the values of a given society. They also scrutinised the notion of culture by bringing into perspective, its association with organisational behaviour and management practice. Similarly, in determining the relativity of culture to organisational practices and theories, Hofstede (1991, p. 48), asserted that culture involves “the collective mental programming which differentiates members of one group or society from those of another”.

Moreover, House et al., (2004) observed that there is minimal debate on the idea that individuals live in a multicultural world, and that this fact should be paid attention to by leaders in organisations. He stated that it is antithetical the effective understanding of leadership to ignore the significance of culture. Also, Muchiri (2011) pointed out that not many scholars have sought to use the African leadership models as Ubuntu in exploring leadership practices in western contexts. This he argued, reflects the over reliance of westernised perspectives of management as a representation of societal expectations within a universal framework.

Ever since the 1980s, research on the significance of the importance of managing across cultures has been explored. However, Branine (2011) identified the influx of multinational companies, the rise in international competition, regional economic integrations, western management education, political and cultural influences and reforms in developing countries as significant drivers that help explain leadership as it
relates to the culture dimension. Also, in alignment with the evolving scope of culture, it is being studied in its relation to leadership and management practices across cultures. To bring about clarity on the fundamental backgrounds of culture and leadership, the next sections review Hofstede’s national cultural dimensions and the GLOBE cultural dimensions.

5.3.1 National Cultural Dimensions- Hofstede’s perspective

Hofstede’s cultural dimensions of societies or nations have become prevalent in the discourse on culture, after he suggested four important dimensions of cross-cultural differences which influence perceptions of people towards work (Hofstede, 1991). However, this supposition by Hofstede was the outcome of his investigation of data gathered from over 116,000 employees of an MNC (multinational company) IBM across 64 countries. The result of the research was the development of the following dimensions:

**Power Distance**: Hofstede (1983, p. 51) claimed that the research work of Mulder 1976 and 1977 had inspired his conceptualising of the term “power distance”. Hofstede (1984, p. 390) defined power distance as a cultural characteristic which explains the degree to which the less powerful person in a given society accepts inequality in power as normal. According to Browaeys and Price (2008), a culture with high power distance would be represented by effective managers who are compassionate autocrats and unequivocally task focused. These managers are usually inaccessible and benefit from the privileges of power accorded to them. In a high power distance culture structure, subordinates are totally dependent on their leaders and most times receive the blame.

In comparison with low power distance cultures, Branine (2011) emphasises that leadership here is more concerned about competency and achievement than the pursuit of power and status. He also highlights that high level of employee participation is
allowed in low power distance cultures in order to accomplish tasks and organisational objectives. The GLOBE study revealed that Nigeria had a mean score of 5.80 and ranked 2nd in the power distance table. This score clearly classifies Nigeria as a society where power distance is highly prominent and also indicates the existence of high power structures. In addition, other African countries such as Morocco >5.80, Zambia >5.31, and South Africa >5.16 show a high power distance.

**Individualism versus Collectivism:** According to Hofstede (2006), *Individualism* refers to groups or societies which reflect loose ties among individuals. In other words, each individual is focused on looking after himself or herself or immediate family, and no one else. Collectivism on the other hand, signifies societies that have original foundations which promote strong attachments to each other. Cultures that lay more emphasis on relationships built as compared to the task performed could be seen as collectivist cultures.

Browaeys and Price (2008) argued that in an organisation where there is collectivistic culture, the focus would be on the collective achievement of the team and not the accomplishment of individual objectives. Based on the GLOBE rankings, in relation to the societal In-group collectivism practices, it can be seen that Nigeria ranked 22nd with a mean score of 5.55. This result indicates a greater collectivism in Nigeria. Also, the more a society is characterised by Institutional Collectivism practices, the more likely it is characterised by Assertiveness and Power Distance practices. Within this context, Hofstede’s studies represent Nigeria as a society with a communal living pattern in which individuals have stronger feelings and a sense of obligation towards the interest of immediate and extended family members and members of social and religious groups they belong to.
Haffar et al., (2016) conducted an exploratory study of Nigerian and British consumers in relation to the influence of national culture on consumer buying behaviour, and argued that culture and consumer behaviour provide an understanding of the residual threads of people that have become ingrained in their being, regardless of their exposure to other cultures. Their results showed that Nigerians are by nature collectivists and are more inclined to put group interests over personal interests.

**Masculinity/Femininity:** Hofstede (2001) contended that a major social component that differentiates cultures is the perception of gender and the role of men and women in society, business and management. Masculinity is the degree to which values such as assertiveness, success, performance and prevail over values such as quality of life, sustaining warm relationships, solidarity, service and care for the weak. Femininity represents the opposite (Hofstede, 1980; 1994).

Branine (2011) pointed out that masculinist cultures are represented by dominant values which include ambition, assertiveness, wealth acquisition, performance, and caring less for others. Contrary to this, he identified the feminist cultures to be characterised by values of love and care which consist of sustaining personal relationships, care for others and care for the environment.

**Uncertainty Avoidance:** According to House et al. (2004), *Uncertainty Avoidance* describes the degree to which a society or organisation depends upon social norms, rules and processes to lessen the instability of future happenings. This definition strongly corresponds with that of Hofstede (2011) who expressed the view that *uncertainty avoidance* pertains to the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by vague or unfamiliar situations. Cultures with *uncertainty- avoidance* tend to view life as a combat against pressure and unease. Although, they may express willingness to assume familiar risks, they are unlikely to accept the threats of an
unfamiliar situation. According to Chua (2013), organisations with high uncertainty-avoidance are more likely to undertake activities that are explicit in contrast to organisations with low uncertainty avoidance. He further clarifies that cultures with high uncertainty avoidance are highly resistant to change.

**Long-term versus Short-term orientation:** The long-term and short-term orientation was developed in Hofstede’s second edition of Cultural Consequences (2001) which he previously referred to as “Confucian dynamism”. However, the background of this orientation is traceable to Kluckhohn and Strodbeck’s (1961) Past, Present and Future Orientation dimension. Furthermore, long-term orientation signifies the extent to which values are oriented towards the future. These values could include the need for persistence or the need for saving. In an opposing view, short-term orientation describes the degree to which values are oriented towards the past and present, such as respect for tradition and fulfilling social obligations (Hofstede, 1983).

**Indulgence versus Restraint:** Hofstede (2010) argued that this dimension reveals the extent to which member in society try to control their desires and impulses. He highlighted indulgent societies to have the inclination to allow relatively free gratification of basic and natural and human desires patterning to having fun and the enjoyment of life. While restrained societies have a conviction that such gratification needs to be curbed and regulated by strict norms and values.

In this era of rapid globalisation, the study of leadership and culture has become prominent. For example, the influence of culture on leadership was reflected in a study by Zagorsek, Jaklic and Stough (2004) who compared leadership practices in Nigeria, Slovenia and the Unites State of America. As a result, they identified significant differences between the three cultures. They found Nigeria to be characterised by moderate uncertainty avoidance, moderate femininity, high masculinity, high power
distance and collectivism. Furthermore, Slovenia was found to be a highly collectivistic, feminine society with high uncertainty avoidance. On the contrary, their findings revealed that the United States was very individualistic, moderately masculine and just a little above average on power distance and uncertainty avoidance.

More recently, a study by Ayodele and Ellis (2015) explored the influence of the Nigerian culture on organisational performance, which they argue would impact Knowledge Management (KM) practices in Nigerian organisations. The study employed Hofstede’s cultural dimensions and found Nigeria to have a masculine-based culture which is demonstrated by a high tendency to achieve. They argue that the masculinist nature of the Nigerian culture is a major reason why employees’ tend to exit their organisations. Also, their findings indicate that the short-term orientation of Nigerian organisations deter a commitment to values related to employee motivation.

Following up on this, they categorised the scores associated to the Nigerian culture by Hofstede’s (2001) 5-D model and rankings against the highest score of 120. Hofstede’s (2001) rankings reported the Power Distance Index (PDI) score of Nigeria as 80. Similarly, Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) score was stated as 55, Individualism (I) rated as 30, Masculinity (M) scored 60 and Long Term Orientation (LTO) was 16.

As a conclusion to Hofstede’s work on culture, Bond (2002) debated that even though it is the most cited research on the dynamic of cross-cultural relationships, it has not been insusceptible to disapprovals. For example, Nasif et al., (1991) contended with Hofstede’s assumption of cultural homogeneity, by suggesting that most nations have ethnic unit and that the variances each ethnic unit has needs to be put into consideration.

Also, Van de Vliert et al., (1999) questioned the reliability of Hofstede’s findings by suggesting that a survey analysis as utilised by Hofstede cannot serve as a suitable
instrument in the evaluation of cultural differences. He goes further to argue that the cultural sensitivity and subjectivity of the measured variables would not produce accurate feedback. A case in point, was when Sinha et al, (2001) represented a few case studies on the coexistence of individualism and collectivism, showing how they often link in an Indian context. They found that in India, concerns for family or family members led to a purely collectivist behaviour, and that the individualist behaviours were intended to attend to collectivist interests. Therefore, they concluded their findings by proposing that Indians had developed collectivist behaviour with collectivist intentions because they viewed the family as a place and family members as an ingroup.

Nevertheless, Hofstede (1998, p. 481) defended his approach by stating that he was not inferring to absolute measurements, but rather assessing differences between cultures and therefore viewed the cross-sectional analysis as ideal. Notwithstanding, McSweeney (2002) argued against Hofstede’s description of one organisational culture at IBM and affirmed that Hofstede did not clarify whether the culture at IBM was in reference to the perceived common practices of the employees within the organisation. A further conundrum, McSweeney (2002) had with the IBM study was how employees from diverse nations with the same job could have a uniformed culture?

5.4 The GLOBE Study and Leadership- African Context

The rise of increased globalisation of business increased the significance of understanding cultural differences. An effective way to comprehend these differences was to first understand existing cultural practices. This quest led to till date the most prominent research project on culture known as The GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness) research project. The fundamental objective of the GLOBE project was to broaden the knowledge that is significant to cross-cultural interactions. The GLOBE study was conducted by investigating 62 societies around the
globe. In addition, it deployed the use of quantitative data to evaluate responses from over 17,000 managers across 951 organisations. The GLOBE study chose a sample of participants from at least three countries in each of the following geographical regions (Africa, Europe, Latin America, Middle East, North America, Pacific Rim and Southern Asia). The GLOBE study scored each of the 62 societies in relation to nine major attributes of cultures and six major global behaviours of leaders.

The nine attributes consist of Future Orientation, Gender Egalitarianism, Assertiveness, Humane Orientation, In-Group Collectivism, Institutional Collectivism, Performance Orientation, Power Concentration versus Decentralization (more commonly referred to as Power Distance in cross-cultural literature), and Uncertainty Avoidance. A key argument by the GLOBE study which consisted of 200 multi-disciplinary global researchers was that these cultural dimensions are closely related with country competitiveness, country prosperity, individual prosperity (gross national product per capita) and the physical and psychological well-being of members of the societies studied (House, et al., 2004).

The researchers of the GLOBE study observed that the rise in cross-cultural interaction and the globalisation of organisations, does not imply that cultural differences are disappearing or diminishing. A major finding of the GLOBE study was that leadership is culturally contingent. In other words, there is a variance of the views on the significance and values of leadership across cultures (House, et al., 2004). Similarly, they point out that the complexity of identifying the effects of culture on leadership, organisational effectiveness, and economic competitiveness of societies led to the widely extensive research of the GLOBE study.

The GLOBE study attempted to determine if there were leadership behaviours that are universally accepted. They identified culture as a key factor that had been much
debated in leadership literature because of its generalizable phenomenon and specific entities. As a result, the researchers at the GLOBE project labelled this term as culturally endorsed leadership theories (CLT). They described CLTs as culturally endorsed dimensions that consist of perceived effective or ineffective leader behaviours which signifies an agreement across each culture. They clarify that these CLT dimensions reflect what leaders literature classifies as “leadership styles”. The GLOBE study found six global CLT leadership dimensions to include: 1). Charismatic/Value-Based leadership. 2). Team Oriented leadership. 3). Participative leadership. 4). Autonomous leadership. 5). Humane-Oriented leadership and 6). Self-Protective leadership.

As a result, their findings with the highest scores revealed Charismatic leadership to contribute to outstanding leadership, having developed a range of mean societal scores among GLOBE countries of 4.5 to 6.5 on a 7-point scale. Similarly, team-oriented leadership was reported to enhance outstanding leadership with a range of 4.7 to 6.2 mean scores across the GLOBE countries.

However, Autonomous leadership derived a range of mean societal scores of 2.3 to 4.7 on a 7-point scale. This reason for this result was because Autonomous leadership was reported to hinder the demonstration of outstanding leadership as and also considerably facilitate outstanding leadership. Also, Self-Protective leadership was universally reported to obstruct outstanding leadership across cultures as it generated a range of mean societal scores of 2.5 to 4.6.

The GLOBE project developed a theoretical model to explain that the attributes that differentiate a specified culture are predictive of organisational practices, leader attributes and behaviours that are most frequently enacted and most effective in that culture. They indicate that societal cultural norms of shared values and practices affect
leader’s behaviour because they argue that existing organisational practices are only a reflection of a leader’s behaviour and attributes. In addition, they state that leadership has an effect on organisational form, culture and practice (Yukl, 2002). Similarly, the studies confirm that societal cultures and practices have a direct impact on organisational culture, whereas, organisational culture has an influence on the broader societal culture (House, Wright and Aditya 1997). Besides investigating the effect of societal cultural values on organisational culture, the findings of the GLOBE project support the premise given by Lombardo (1983) and Schein (1992) who argued that organisational culture and practices affect leaders’ behaviour and is a reason why leaders often alter their leadership styles.

Similarly, the GLOBE project found that certain organisational contingencies as the work environment, the size of the organisation and technology affect organisational form, culture and practices. Equally, their findings revealed that leader effectiveness is a function of the interface between the organisational contingencies above and leader behaviours. Furthermore, the GLOBE project provided an illustration affirming that leaders who are not accepted by employees will find it more challenging to influence these employees within an organisation. Therefore, they proposed that the leaders’ acceptance by followers facilitate leader effectiveness. In summary, the GLOBE project argued that the different value systems and cultural practices and the organisational contingencies of an organisation is a significant predictor of the leader behaviours and organisational practices that are perceived as utmost acceptable. Having provided a background of the GLOBE study and represented the practical implications of their findings, the next section would review studies that have applied the GLOBE study to their research on culture.
5.4.1 Application of the GLOBE project in Africa and Other Cultures

In reviewing leadership behaviours across cultures, Wanasika et al., (2011) explained an analysis of managerial leadership in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) namely: Nigeria, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Namibia and Zambia. These countries were also represented as the GLOBE Sub-Saharan Africa Cluster. According to Wanasika et al., (2011), the leadership characteristics and organisational systems could be presented under the following subjects:

i. **Ubuntu Spirit**: There was recognition of the Ubuntu spirit which as discussed earlier emphasises on the significance of harmony, promoting social relations, as well as the expression of tolerance and forgiveness at higher levels. Other studies as Taylor’s (2014) revealed the Ubuntu spirit as a term that represents how people and communities interact, based upon the aphorism that ‘a person is a person through other people’ (Tutu, 1999,p.35; Mnyaka and Motlhabi, 2005,p. 218; Mkhize, 2008, p.40).

ii. **Group solidarity**: The Sub-Saharan African (SSA) Cultures investigated, all expressed traditional values of group solidarity. This echoed family and tribal loyalty, as well as teamwork, service and reliability to internal groups. Taylor (2014) stated that Ubuntu leadership focuses on the sharing of collective enterprise and a long-term commitment from employees.

iii. **Team-Oriented and Humane**: The researchers argued that the leadership styles of outstanding leaders in SSA indicated that the leaders were team-oriented and humane. Servant leaders were assumed to fit into this category, just as McCann, Graves and Cox (2014) argued that servant leadership focused on the need for team
integration and employee satisfaction, and growth of the employees’ within and outside the organisation.

iv. **Patriarchal and matrimonial male dominance:** The male gender dominated preference for leadership roles, and this could be traced to the premise that foundationally in these SSA regions, women had not been involved in tribal leadership. Moreover, previous studies show that servant leadership represents partnership over patriarchy in which the leader promotes sharing of responsibility and ownership, so that he or she can be accountable to the organisation (Russell and Stone, 2002).

v. **Colonialism:** The report maintained that the factor of colonialism in these SSA countries had negatively detached these SSA nations from many cultural mechanisms in the past. This is in agreement with the study of House and Aditya (1997) who stated that theories of leadership originated from the United States of America. They argued the need to recall that these theories were a representation of American leadership. As a result, these leadership theories and management studies have generally omitted the voice of the racial ‘Other’ in relation to Africa (Jack and Westwood, 2009).

vi. **Corruption, Poverty, Tribalism and Violence:** The existence of a culture of corruption, poverty, tribalism and violence was reported. This culture generates a negative perception of organisational and political leaders and leaves followers in a state of vulnerability which could result to tolerance of these negative cultural elements as aforementioned. For example, an early study by Dike (2005), revealed that corruption in Nigeria is demonstrated in bureaucratic forms within the politics of Nigeria such as rigging of elections and biased appointments of party loyalists. In addition, other forms of corruption are made manifest through nepotism, extortion, bribery, favouritism, fraud and embezzlements. Ogundiya (2009) extends this view by describing corruption in Nigeria as the bane socio-economic and political development in Nigeria.
Kamoche et al., (2015) looked at the dynamics of managing people in the diverse cultural and institutional context of Africa. In their study, they underpinned the fact that prominent cultural studies including GLOBE project have overlooked the diversity of Africa as they are inclined to look at African countries as aggregated regions. A case in point, reflects how the investigative study by Hofstede (1983) into the influence of national culture on work-associated values treated African countries as clusters. Another major argument is that the GLOBE project out of a sample size of 62 countries globally, only has 4 African countries represented. They contend that it could be misleading to assume that these 4 countries are a comprehensive representation culture from an African perspective.

Hence, the major gap still remains unsolved of the lack of an integral analysis that collaborates individual African countries with reference to extensive cross-cultural and leadership research. Nonetheless, as their research sought to advance understanding of the influence of culture to the effectiveness of business and management in Africa, they draw attention of the need to look at different levels of cultural perspective which include: the national level, organisational level and individual level. The reason for this emerges from the fact that the African employee’s sense of belonging within foreign firms, for example, has a substantial influence on the approach in which they describe organisational identity.

Surprisingly, not many studies have been conducted to explore the GLOBE project in relation to the knowledge of culture and leadership from an African perspective. A study was carried by Waldman et al., (2006) to investigate the cultural and leadership variables related to corporate social responsibility values that were applicable in decision-making processes of managers and found that African demonstrated the
effects of the cultural dimensions of institutional collectivism and power distance were a predictor of social responsibility values on Top Management Team members (TMTs). Their findings corroborate with those of McWilliams and Siegel (2001) which proposed that CSR issues were more considered in the decision-making process by managers in wealthier countries than in poorer countries. Their argument for taking this stance emerges from the fact that higher per capita gross domestic product is positively associated with managerial values focusing on shareholders. However, their findings also indicated how managers in wealthier countries have a less tendency to be concerned about the welfare of the greater community or society in their decision-making process because they believe societal concerns should be handled by the government.

The necessity to investigate and analyse the findings and the recommendations of the GLOBE project led to the emergence of a number of cross-cultural management and leadership studies. For example, by Javidan et al., (2006) recognised that Global leadership had become a significant component for the success and effectiveness of large multinational companies. They draw upon the limitation of certain cultural nuances that were exclusively recognised; such as not showing the soles of your feet to a guest in an Arab country, but criticised the lack of theoretical perspectives on how to effectively lead in foreign countries. For this reason, they employed the use of the findings from the GLOBE project to offer a rational basis for theorising leadership differences globally. They utilised a hypothetical case of an American executive who led four teams across the following cultures (Brazil, Egypt, France and China) to debate the cultural implications such American executive would be faced with.

They found that because of the high in-group collectivism, Brazilian employees would likely dislike a leader who is individualistic, autonomous and independent. In drawing
upon the difference between the societal expectations of a leader, they suggested that what may be seen as an open debate to the American manager may be considered as a violent and very unacceptable behaviour by the Brazilian subordinates. In their study of the French workforce culture, they pointed out that while the American executive may seem to have a strong preference for a compassionate and sensitive leadership style which demonstrates empathy, the workforce in France may have a negative view about these attributes because they are not susceptible to a behaviour of offering apologies. Furthermore, in determining the work culture of Egypt, they provide evidence that its existing culture may have been influenced by the fact that leadership in Egypt had been dictatorial in the forms of Pharaohs. These leaders were expected to lead by representing a self-assured image and as such would not want to appear weak to subjects.

Bringing this rich history into current perspective, Javidan et al., (2006) found that the informal leadership style of the American executive would be considered as an unworthy characteristic of a leader. This is due to the fact that employees expect a high level of distinction between themselves and their leader who has been giving so much responsibility to lead them. Egypt was also represented as a country that has very high in-group collectivism which only reflects the high extent to which Egyptians take pride in belonging to a certain group and being loyal to such group. For instance, in Egypt, leaders build their legitimacy not necessarily by accomplishing high performance but by forging loyalty to group and group values.

The GLOBE project had shown China to reflect a culture with high-performance orientation, high institutional orientation, and high in-group collectivism. It also acknowledged how the Chinese philosophy of “guan xi” had influenced the need to develop personal and relationship ties even within the organisation. Even the word “self"
is known to have a negative connotation. Therefore, the researchers argue that the American executive leading a team in China needs to be cautious of his or her manners because politeness and good moral conduct are expected from the subordinates. In addition, the Chinese workforce is more driven when the American executive focuses on their high performance culture and incorporates and encourages the setting and accomplishment of set targets.

Consequently, Javidan et al., (2006) developed a model that distinguished between universal facilitators of leadership effectiveness, the universal impediments to leadership effectiveness and the culturally contingent endorsement of leader attributes. They stated the universal facilitators of leadership effectiveness to include honesty and integrity, having foresight, being positive, encouraging and a good communicator to followers.

Following this, Javidan et al., (2006) outlined the universal impediments to leadership effectiveness as self-protective, malevolent and autocratic behaviours of a leader over followers. They concluded by identifying the culturally contingent endorsement of leader attributes as a leader being individualistic, status conscious and a self-sacrificial risk taker. This section has reviewed the GLOBE project in relation to Africa. It has explored leadership characteristics that are indicators of the Sub-Saharan African (SSA) culture. I concluded by reviewing studies that have applied the GLOBE project their analysis of cross-cultural leadership.

5.5 Servant Leadership, Ubuntu and Culture: The development of hypotheses and a theoretical framework.

Having reviewed the relevant literature on servant leadership, in relation to culture, job satisfaction, organisational citizenship, employee performance, and then developed the research hypotheses, the following theoretical framework is presented (See Figure 5.1
below). The framework in Fig 5.1 below presents the hypotheses that have been developed from the review of literature. It begins by indicating the characteristics of servant leadership, otherwise referred to as personal leader traits of the servant leader that were investigated in relation to the research problem. The framework also revealed how the demographic variables of gender, age, work experience and staff positions would be tested against job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour in relation to servant leadership. The final phase of the framework is represented by the element of employee performance which would be tested as an explicit outcome of the other hypotheses developed.

It is evident from the foregoing literature that there is no evidence of the investigation of the role of servant leadership in relation to the Nigerian private sector. Based on this, it seems that a study like this is needed which provides a holistic view of the servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. This has led to the development of a comprehensible conceptual framework below that addresses the gaps presented in the literature regarding the relationship between servant leadership characteristics and leadership effectiveness, the impact of employees’ perceptions of these characteristics in relation to job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour. Also, the effects of culture on the application of servant leadership from an unexplored perspective, which is the Nigerian private sector and finally, showing the link between these objectives mentioned to employee performance, as the final outcome.

As far as the practice of servant leadership is concerned, only few of the literature has focused on the characteristics of servant leadership or the attributes of a servant leader that distinguishes him or her from leaders who adopt other leadership styles. A few studies from (Spears, 1995; Russell and Stone, 2002; Patterson, 2003; Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006; Van Dierendonck, 2011 have reported servant leadership characteristics to include listening, empathy, emotional healing, persuasion, awareness,
foresight, conceptualization, stewardship, growth and community building. The positive aspect of most of these studies is that they defined and explained how these characteristics are demonstrated by a leader. However, the main argument is that defining and explaining these characteristics of servant leadership are not the same as showing the relationship between these characteristics and leadership effectiveness. The dependent variables include all the characteristics of servant leadership which are listening, empathy, emotional healing, persuasion, awareness, foresight, conceptualization, stewardship, growth and community building and leadership effectiveness is the independent variable.

However, the adapted data on the questionnaire relied on decision quality (Muhammad et al., 2009), follower commitment (Brown, 2003) and follower satisfaction (Hatfield et al., 1985) as the mediating variables that influence leadership effectiveness. In addition, the questionnaire modified items from Denison et al. (1995) to identify leader roles. Even though, some evidence can be identified in the literature regarding the significance of these characteristics, this current study is arguably the first study to investigate the relationship between these characteristics in relation to leadership effectiveness in Nigerian private sector companies. Therefore, the following hypothesis is postulated:

H1- There is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/personal leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness.

Several studies reviewed in the literature have identified servant leadership as a predictor of job satisfaction. For example, Anderson (2005) and Van Tassell (2006) stated that the demonstration of the characteristics of servant leadership could lead to job satisfaction in organisations the USA. Similarly, Chavez (2011) reported job
satisfaction as the long-term effect of servant leadership in Bolivian organisations. However, most studies investigating servant leadership in relation to job satisfaction have mostly been conducted in North America. Due to this, there is a scarcity of literature involving other cultures, especially Nigeria. Another limitation to the major studies on servant leadership and job satisfaction is the lack of considerable attention to key demographic variables as gender, age, duration of employment and staff rankings in their analysis. There have been a few studies on organisational citizenship behaviour in relation to leadership from an African perspective.

For example, Ndubueze and Akanni (2015) found that autocratic leadership would not help leaders within the private sector in Nigeria understand the work conditions that drive organisational citizenship behaviour. They argued that democratic leadership could improve organisational citizenship behaviour. However, no study known to the researcher has investigated the relationship between servant leadership and organisational citizenship in the Nigerian private sector. Therefore, given the link between the independent variables of job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour and the strong identification of these theoretical gap, the next hypotheses are formulated:

**H$_{2a}$** - There is a significant relationship between the following demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and staff positions) and the effect of servant leadership on job satisfaction.

**H$_{2b}$** - There is a significant relationship between the following demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and staff positions) and the effect of servant leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour.

It can be concluded from the literature reviewed above that leadership and culture should be examined jointly and not in isolation. The literature reviewed has shown that
the concept of culture is significant in explaining leadership from cross-cultural perspectives. The GLOBE project led by played an important part in the literature, and even though its fundamental objective was to broaden the knowledge that is significant to cross-cultural interactions, several arguments have been raised. Although research on culture has been argued to constantly evolve (Baldwin et al., 2006) because culture serves as an indicator of social reality, questions have been raised as to whether Hofstede’s findings on culture and the GLOBE project should be accepted as a suitable analysis of cultural differences. Even though the GLOBE project has represented the Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries including Nigeria as cultures that are predominantly masculinist, collectivist, and with high power distance, it is still debatable because the findings of the GLOBE project was the results of evaluating 4 African countries out of 54.

Up till date, not many studies have been conducted to explore the GLOBE project in relation to the knowledge of culture and leadership from an African perspective. Yet there is still insufficient research reflecting culture and leadership from an African perspective. Also, the literature reviewed has identified a major gap in researchers advancing scholarly activity of leadership theory in Africa (Muchiri, 2011), and this includes servant leadership. Although servant leadership is a rapidly growing concept (Spears, 1995; Russell and Stone, 2002; and Van Dierendonck, 2011), few studies have investigated servant leadership in relation to the culture in Africa.

For instance, when examining the concept of servant leadership in Rwanda, Brubaker (2013) pointed out that while a servant leader’s encouragement of delegation of tasks to followers so as to enable them grow on their jobs may is effective in Starbucks in the USA, it may not be effective in the same Starbucks in Ghana, because the culture has a societal expectation of leaders to be fully in charge. Therefore, such a leader could be
considered weak, incompetent and negligent of his or her duties. The reason for this illustration is to signify the need to investigate the servant leadership concept in relation to the Nigerian culture. The aim to achieve this, the following hypothesis has been developed:

$H_3$: There is a positive relationship between the effects of culture and the application of servant leadership.

The reviewed literature has revealed how employee performance can be enhanced through the practise of the servant leadership style. However, there is still unsubstantiated data reflecting the knowledge of the relationship between servant leadership and employee performance in Africa. For example, Murigi (2013) found that the use of absolute supervision, punishments and direct command structures improved employee performance. However, this study was in relation to autocratic leadership. Due to this theoretical gap, this current study would be pioneering research examining the relationship between servant leadership and employee performance. Also, this research seeks to determine if the effect of the above three hypotheses would lead to the concluding hypothesis which is:

$H_4$: There is a positively significant relationship between servant leadership and employee performance
Figure 5.1: Postulated Conceptual Framework
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5.6 Conclusion

This chapter set out to reintroduce the concept of servant leadership, but this time, its focus was on the application of the concept of servant leadership. This chapter has shown that servant leadership is a contemporary concept of leadership. However, just as in India (Das et al., 2014), there is still insufficient research of servant leadership from an African perspective. The findings to emerge from this chapter is that the practice of servant leadership enhances job satisfaction (Anderson, 2005), reduces employee turnover rates (Hofman, 2007) and increases employee engagement (Carter and Baghurst, 2014).

Other significant findings to emerge is how past research on culture still influence leadership studies today. There was a review the very prominent Hofstede’s national cultural dimensions and the GLOBE (Global Leadership and organisational Behaviour Effectiveness) project on cross-cultural difference. This study identified Nigeria’s ranking in a few of the national cultural dimensions. Hofstede’s (1991) cultural dimensions included: power distance, individualism vs collectivism, masculinity vs femininity. For instance, just as Branine (2011) pointed out that masculinist cultures are represented by dominant values which include ambition, assertiveness, wealth acquisition, performance, and caring less for others, Nigeria scored 60 in its rating as a masculinist culture. Other dimensions that were reviewed were uncertainty avoidance, long-term vs short-term orientation and indulgence vs restraint. Evidence from the literature review showed that culture is an integral part of this study. For this reason, the concept of Ubuntu leadership was discussed and in conclusion, this study developed a theoretical framework to test the hypothesis. The theoretical framework explains the main themes that are being investigated in this study.
Chapter Six: Research Methodology

The previous chapter reviewed the extant literature relating to leadership and culture. The main focus of the review was on servant leadership and ubuntu. This chapter reinforces the aim and objectives of the research, outlines the research questions and hypotheses. It articulates the philosophical approach and the methods used in the course of this research. It also explains the processes through which data were collected and analysed. The chapter further explains the processes and actions taken to ensure reliability, dependability and validity of the research findings. Finally, the conclusion of the chapter highlights certain limitations of the methodologies adopted and the process of data gathering and analysis.

This chapter is divided into thirteen sections. The first sections represent the introduction to the chapter. The second section is a review of the aims and objectives. The third and fourth sections will look at the questions and hypotheses developed for the research. The fifth section highlights on the research paradigm which helps to identify the philosophical constructs of the study. The seventh and eight sections respectively classify the research approach of the study in relation to theory and research, and then a technical framework showing the research design used for data collection and data analysis. The quantitative and qualitative research strategies implemented in this research is revealed in the ninth section. There is a further breakdown of the specific data collection methods applied in the research in the tenth section. It comprises of the research population, sample, questionnaire design, pilot study and data collection procedures. The eleventh section offers a distinct account of the methods of data analysis utilised. In concluding this chapter, the twelfth section highlights the ethical considerations in undertaking this research.
6.2 Aim and Objectives

The study contributes further to existing research on servant leadership by investigating whether the applicability of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies would enhance employee performance, organisational performance and generally become an effective leadership style in an African context. Therefore, the main aim of this study is to investigate whether or not the application of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies would be effective, sustainable and a useful tool for transforming such companies and improving employee and organisational performance. More explicitly, the objectives of the study are as follows:

i. To investigate the extent to which servant leadership characteristics and personal leader traits influence employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness in Nigerian private sector companies;

ii. To examine the effects of demographic variables on the application of servant leadership as a means of enhancing job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour in Nigerian private sector companies;

iii. To analyse the effects of culture on the application of servant leadership; and

iv. To understand the impact of servant leadership on employee performance, having achieved objectives 1 to 3.
6.3 Research Hypotheses

In order to meet the aforementioned objectives, the study developed several hypotheses that arose from the review of literature and are to be tested against empirical evidence. They are itemised as follows:

\( H_1 \) - There is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/person leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness;

\( H_{2a} \) - There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and position) and the effect of servant leadership on job satisfaction;

\( H_{2b} \) - There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and position) and the effect of servant leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour;

\( H_3 \) - There is a positive relationship between the effects of culture and the application of servant leadership; and

\( H_4 \) - There is a positively significant relationship between employee performance and servant leadership.

For relevant data to be gathered in order to test the hypotheses above and to provide answers to the research questions, there is a need to discuss the philosophical underpinnings of the research that show how the research was conducted.

6.4 Research Philosophy

Research is established upon assumptions about our perceptions and understanding of the world. Another significant point is to note that these assumptions reinforce each research strategy and methods selected as part of that strategy. Therefore, research philosophy represents “an overarching term relating to the development of knowledge and the nature of that knowledge in relation to research” (Saunders, Lewis and
Thornhill, 2009). However, there is an argument that what is essential is not whether research should be informed by philosophy but the effective ability for researchers to reflect upon the philosophical choices made.

6.4.1 Research Paradigm

In attempting to simplify the complexity of the understanding of paradigms, Kuhn (1962, p.8) explained that “paradigms are universally recognised scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners”.

A research paradigm represents a theoretical framework that influences the approach to which knowledge is studied and interpreted (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Mertens, 2005). In addition, MacNaughton, Rolf and Siraj-Blatchford (2001) describe paradigm as one with three fundamental elements that include a belief depicting the nature of knowledge, a methodology and criteria for validity.

There are diverse views on what research paradigm symbolises. For example, Creswell et al, (2003) describe the paradigm in relation to the evidence of knowledge. Whereas, Mackenzie and Knipe, (2006) identify the paradigm using the following terms; epistemology, ontology, research methodologies and research demonstrated through rational and clear expectations. They argued that the clarity of these expectations justifies the need for the research. Burrell and Morgan (1979) distinguished four paradigms for analysing social theory. They identified them as radical humanist, radical structuralist, interpretive and functionalist. The functionalist paradigm was interpreted as social positivism (Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

Moreover, Morgan and Smircich (1980) identified positivism and interpretivism, as the two major research paradigms through which all forms of research are based upon. The positivist paradigm originated from the discipline of natural sciences and was largely
used until the late 19th century, and it involved systematic methods used by scientists in the processes of observation, experiments and the application of inductive logic to determine explanatory theories that could be used for prediction (Smith, 1983).

The background of this research is such that although it used a positivist approach by means of quantitative data, this study was advanced primarily from an interpretivist epistemology that is dependent upon a constructive ontology. This research used a mixed methods approach, which although involved the distribution of questionnaires and quantitative methods of data analysis, superior emphasis was placed on the interview data and in the thematic analysis of the interviews and documented data collected. A major advantage of this research being positivist is that it in using quantitative data, it supported the notion by Wallman et al., (2011) that reality is independent of us and had its objective and the discovery of theories, constructed on empirical research. Also, the use of quantitative data analysis in this researched provided information that could be considered objective in order to develop justifiable assumptions.

In view of the emergence of globalisation, industrialisation and capitalism, the study of natural phenomena gave way for social phenomena. In addition, because theorists defied the paradigms effected by social scientists, a substitute paradigm came into existence known as interpretivism or phenomenology (Collis and Hussey, 2009). Interpretivism in practice is likened to a symbiotic relationship in which the researcher interacts with that being researched, as it is impractical to disassociate what exist in the social world from what is in the mind of the researcher. (Smith, 1983; Creswell, 2014).
As stated earlier, this study was primarily advanced using the interpretivist paradigm. Researchers as Glesne and Peshkin, (1992); Silverman (2000); Thomas (2003); Nind and Todd, (2011) collectively uphold the notion that the interpretivist paradigm primarily uses qualitative methods of research. Similarly, Corbin and Strauss, (2008); Thanh and Thanh (2015) conclude that Interpretivism represents research in which the findings are based on qualitative and not quantitative research data.

The subjective nature of this study in that it explored employees’ perceptions of leadership behaviours and the influence of culture on leadership practice meant that the interpretivist paradigm was most suitable. As a result, this study benefitted from having the participants interpret their own understanding of key elements of this study, rather than the adoption of a general view. Also, in the interpretivist paradigm was more practical in that it allowed room for multiple perspectives and versions of truth (Willis, 2007).

As this research was driven to develop a better understanding of the servant leadership concept in Nigeria, the use of the interpretivist paradigm was advantageous. Other merits of using this approach was that it made this study well detailed as participants had had the freedom to express their understanding of the phenomenon related to this study. The use of the interpretivist paradigm had earlier been supported by Morehouse (2012) who stated that the acceptance of multiple perspectives as exemplified in Interpretivism helps develop a comprehensive understanding of the situation.

The use of the interpretivist paradigm in this study was selected for its validity because its data is argued to be trustworthy (Collis and Hussey, 2009; Mack, 2010; Creswell and Poth, 2017). This study utilised the research method of Interviews and Observations which would be discussed later in this chapter.
6.4.2 **Epistemological Assumption**

Scholars describe epistemology as the science of evaluating the way human beings comprehend knowledge about their perceptions of existence, and also helps answer the question as to how individuals can attain true cognition (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Becker and Niehaves, 2007). Also, Cram and Mertens (2016) define epistemology as simply the relationship between the knower and what would be known. Since the assumption of epistemology centres on that which is accepted as valid knowledge, it goes further to inspect the relationship between the researcher and the subject of such research. Positivists uphold the view that knowledge can only be regarded as knowledge if it merges from phenomena that are observable and measurable. On the contrary, interpretivists close the gap between the researcher and the subject of research. This usually comes through different forms of participative inquiry (Collis and Hussey, 2014).

The interpretivist paradigm embraced in the existing research on servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies indicates an epistemological standpoint which invariably necessitates the proximity between the researcher and the research. For instance, this study involved an engagement process between the researcher and the research participants during interviews. To this end, the derived knowledge was subjective to interpretation.

6.4.3 **Ontological Assumption**

The research that focuses on the nature of reality is illustrated by a research assumption called Ontology. It represents an analysis of “what is” and “how it is”. (Van Foerster, 1985; Mertens, 2009; Collis and Hussey, 2014). In identifying positivist and interpretivist outlooks on the ontological assumption, positivists assume that social reality is objective and external to the researcher. This implies therefore, that there is
the existence of only one reality and that we all have the same idea of reality. In opposition, Interpretivists believe in the subjectivity of social reality based on the argument that it is socially constructed. This reinforces the premise that each individual has his or her own sense of reality and hence there exists multiple realities. A clear depiction of this notion is represented by Mercier (2009) who asserted that ‘Life is not what we live; it is what we imagine we are living’.

According to Bryman (2016), Objectivism describes an ontological position that emphasises that social phenomena and their meanings have an existence that is autonomous of social actors. Therefore, it implies that social phenomena and the categories that we use in everyday discourse have an existence that is independent or separate from actors. Sharma, Pathak and Sinha (2017) asserted that objectivism is founded on the belief that knowledge should be parallel to reality. This implies that the objectivist seeks to define knowledge as a representation of the reality of the world even as the real world is viewed as absolute, fixed, objective and independent of the learner. Even though this study took an objectivist ontological standpoint by not distorting the reality of the social phenomena studies when using qualitative methods, this research is more affiliated to the notion of subjectivism. The interpretivist paradigm is incorporated in this research.

Ratner (2002) stated that subjectivism is often debated to be the sine qua non of qualitative methodology. Creswell and Poth (2017) described subjectivism as a form of ontology which presumes that perceptions and actions of social actors constitute the basis for the creation of social phenomena. They explain that previously, subjectivism was referred to as constructivism which was then represented as an ontological position which stresses that social phenomena and their meanings are continuously being accomplished by social actors.
As Bryman (2016) pointed out that the development of social phenomena is not only through a process of social interaction but also derived from a constant state of revision, this study utilised subjectivity in designing the topic of the study, formulation of the hypotheses, choosing methodologies and data interpretation. As a result, this study did not look at any form of social reality from a definitive perspective. This standpoint is similar to Sharma, Pathak and Sinha (2017) who argued that unlike other theories of knowledge, subjectivism rejects a static, passive or fixed view of knowledge and refuses to accord it an objective value.

### 6.4.4 Axiological Assumptions

The axiological assumption lays emphasis on the role of values in research. Saunders and Lewis (2012) argue that the role of the researcher’s value is of significance at all phases of the research in order to achieve reliable results from the research. The axiological assumption is considered about the ethical nature of the research and looks at the basis in which ethical theory and research practice is defined. It goes further to examine what should be identified as ethical or moral behaviour in research and how the researchers deal with ethical issues in the conduct of research across cultural complex communities (Mertens, 2007). There are different schools of thought between positivists and interpretivists in relation to the axiological assumption.

While positivists consider that the entire process of research is value free, interpretivists uphold the notion that all researchers adopt values, whether it is revealed explicitly or not (Collis and Hussey, 2009). Axiological assumptions that are positivist are more conducted in research involving natural sciences. This is because positivists adopt an independent stand in their research as they explore the phenomena investigated as objects. As a result, the positivist axiological assumption is uncommon in social sciences because the discipline of social sciences is concerned with individuals'
behaviours and actions. However, interpretivists accept as true the notion that values enhance the derivation of facts and thus draw interpretations from them. There is a general opinion among interpretivists that the researcher is significantly involved in the research itself. This study adopts the axiological assumption because it is in the social science discipline and considers that focus on value is essential to the results of this research, thereby implementing the interpretivist paradigm in the research.

6.4.5 Rhetorical Assumption

The nature of language a researcher chooses to adopt is influenced by the paradigm under which the research is conducted to a significant degree. The language utilised in this research in its entirety had at its fundamental approach, the use of rhetorical assumption (Collis and Hussey, 2009). The formal writing style is tends to commonly used in a positivist research, while no specific preferential writing style is recommended in interpretivist research. For the reason that this research would immensely contribute towards the effective leadership of Nigerian private sector companies, it assumed formal and business language in its writing.

6.4.6 Methodological Assumption

In attempting to create understanding of social research, Mouton (1996) described research methodology as the foundation to which any discipline is built, while Marais and Marais (2016) stated that research methodology represents the whole set of established approaches to discovering new information or ratifying existing information. However, there is not one of these approaches that have autonomy of discovering the truth. Methodology concentrates on the researcher's implementation of different techniques or procedural framework to undertake the research. It consists of a collaboration of approaches used to make enquiries into a particular situation (Lincoln and Guba, 2000; Easterby-Smith, Golden-Biddle and Locke, 2008;
Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2009; Leitch, Hill and Harrison, 2010). While positivists tend to utilise experiments and survey methods in conducting research, interpretivists engage in the investigation of pure subjectivity and apply several methods to derive varied perceptions of a given problem. This research has adopted the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods in the study.

### 6.4.7 Research Approach

It is important to take into consideration the need to select the most suitable research approach because it reveals how best the research questions would be answered and how the research would be explored. In any given study, researchers have the freedom to select from deductive and inductive approaches or the combination of both.

The deductive and inductive approaches are employed sequentially in research reasoning. An induction connotes a conclusion that is established upon circumstantial evidence; for example, the argument for Democracy theory. However, no matter how the comprehensive evidence supporting theory, it will never be absolute proof that democracy represents the views of every individual in society. On the contrary, deductions are inevitably true; for instance, if \( a = \frac{b}{4} \), then \( b = 4a \), and this requires no other interpretation. Deduction signifies the difference between reasonable intuition and infinite certainty. Having said that, a foundation for developing hypotheses that would inform the research is provided by reasonable intuition and logical certainties.

As was previously suggested, the reliability of any research hypotheses is largely dependent to the degree with which it leads to a sufficient explanation of the subject under investigation. The deductive approach would make us develop research hypotheses that can be verified logically. Whereas, the inductive approach reasoning explores an organisational problem, a business challenge or even an economic issue
and brings together circumstantial evidence that points to a universal and positively accurate conclusion. Collis and Hussey (2009) argued the “inductive research to involve a study in which theory is developed from the observation of empirical reality”. Similarly, Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) hold the view that the inductive approach commences with a transition from specific observations to broader generalisations and theories.

These observations are then used to detect patterns and regularities, which constructs the tentative hypothesis to be investigated, and this ends up in developing some general conclusions or theories. Following this, Bryman and Bell (2011) stated that induction research is a scientific process in which we generalise across a limited number of instances, observations and examples in order to obtain an acceptable and credible explanation for the object of investigation.

This study combined both the deductive and inductive research approaches. Considering the fact, that the study was exploring the servant leadership theory and testing its applicability in Nigerian private sector organisations, it found the deductive research approach very efficient. The deductive research approach made it possible for this study to first develop hypotheses after investigating the servant leadership theory in context. The reason for using the research approach was that it made it possible for the study to explain the causal relationships between concepts and variables.

Also, the study was able to provide quantitative evaluations of certain variables and relevant concepts. In concluding this study, the deductive research approach would make it possible for the study to generalise research findings to an extent. The inductive research approach was also utilised due to the scarcity of sources related to the investigated concept. Moreover, several researchers such as Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Lowe, 2002; Yin, 2009; Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2007; have recommended
the use of deductive and inductive approaches in social science research. They put the point forward that the emerging pluralism of research methods utilised to study factors affecting organisations makes the multi-method research an appropriate approach. The advantages of using multiple methods is that it avoids the limitations that exist in any of the one research approaches. Furthermore, it eliminates the ineffectiveness of a single method approach by implementing different research techniques in a process known as triangulation.

6.4.8 Research Design

For research to begin, the researcher needs to design the path of the proposed research project. Vogt and Johnson (2011) argued that research design is the science and art of planning procedures for conducting studies in order to derive the most valid and relevant findings. The essence of determining a research design is to give the researcher a detailed plan that gives the research focus and direction. Research design is a framework used in data collection and analysis of a study (Churchill, 1979; Bryman and Bell, 2011).

The significance of adopting an appropriate research design commences from the critical relationship that occurs between the theory and argument that informed the research and the collected empirical data (Nachmais and Nachmais 2008). Bryman and Bell (2007) asserts that the selection of the most suitable research design “reflects decisions about the priority being given to a range of dimensions of the research process”, which in turn has an effect on the methodological procedures such as sampling and other forms of statistics.
To identify an effective research design, McKerchar (2008) classified the following vital characteristics:

i. There is an appropriate fit between the methodology and a paradigm that is understood and accepted by others.

ii. That there is an essential framework that dictates the manner in which the research is undertaken.

iii. That suitable strategy of inquiry or research methods are employed.

This study employed the mixed methods research design as it involved a deliberate implementation of quantitative research that evaluated the frequency of relevant variables in this study. As this study was aimed at examining multi-level perspective and cultural influences, it assumed the mixed methods research design to be the most effective. The reason for this, was that the mixed methods research design would utilise the advantages of both quantitative and qualitative research strategies. Other merits of using the mixed methods research design was provided by Tashakkori and Creswell (2007) who stated that:

i. While narrative information has the ability to add meaning to numeric data, numeric data can add precision to narrative information

ii. The counterpoise relationship between the quantitative and qualitative research strategies would strengthen the research

iii. The mixed methods research design help provide a robust understanding of the research problem

iv. The mixed methods research design would effectively support the development of new knowledge.
6.5 Research Strategy

According to Jankowicz (2005), research strategy is an organised and methodical process undertaken in the collection and analysis of data to ensure that information can be derived to answer the research questions posed by the researcher. In similar terms, Bryman and Bell (2007) define research strategy as a general orientation to the conduct of business research. Moreover, research strategy takes into cognizance the quantitative and qualitative research, which include the divergent cluster of strategies such as survey, experiments, case study, ethnography, action research, grounded theory and interviews (Bryman and Bell, 2007).

6.5.1 Quantitative and Qualitative Research Strategies

The primary notion of quantitative research is the need for research designs to be centred on an objective view of the world and thus follow the positivist paradigm (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Lowe, 2002). According to McDaniel and Gates (2006), quantitative research approach consists of both structured and formal methods and requires the use of structured questions through which response options have been predetermined with the involvement of an adequate number of respondents.

The fundamental objective of quantitative research is to evaluate in measurable terms and analyse the causal relationships between variables within a value-free framework (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). This supports the views of Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009) who highlight the term ‘quantitative’ as one used to represent any technique for data collection or data analysis process that derives and utilises numerical data. These could be presented in the form of questionnaires, graphs and other forms of statistical data. It is important that the measurements are objective and that data are collected regarding each subject on a large scale. The next phase involves the transformation of
the information into measurable data (i.e. numbers and amounts) which would then be statistically analysed in order to arrive at conclusions.

A key objective therefore, of quantitative research is to create and deploy mathematical theories, models and hypotheses to explain natural phenomena. A distinctive feature of this research approach is that it allows researchers test their hypotheses and thus rely on data as an objective measure to validate findings. Although quantitative research has notable advantages in terms of conducting large-scale surveys, it is often criticised for its lack of depth and specificity; which in turn confines research to ‘isolated and de-contextualised variables (Auxier, 2001). Another criticism is that statistical methods could mislead rather than effectively explain human behaviour because of its restricted theoretical constructs.

This study is using quantitative research because it developed structured questions for participants to answer. These questions were distributed in the form of questionnaires. This study used a correlational quantitative research approach which Bernard (2012) argued can explore the relationship between variables. It is also quantitative in nature because data collected would be analysed using statistical methods as the SPSS to measure the level of relationships between dependent and independent variables. This study found the quantitative research strategy beneficial because it would support the study in meeting the objective of providing data summaries that support generalisations about the investigated phenomenon that is servant leadership theory. The use of quantitative research to this study would help to delimit personal bias as the process of quantitative data collection distanced the researcher from influencing the participants in any way.

On the other hand, qualitative research is an approach that involves the collection, analysis and interpretation of data through the means of observation. A highlight of the
term ‘qualitative’ in research denotes any data collection technique employed to obtain non-numerical data (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2009). Qualitative research deploys techniques such as in-depth interviews, semi-structured interviews, unstructured interviews, focus group interviews and participant observations. It usually involves a small, yet purposeful population sample of reliable respondents that can equip the research study with vital information, than using a larger population.

Qualitative research focuses on words and observation to interpret reality and attempt to describe people in natural situations. Qualitative research is established upon the philosophy that the ‘objects’ studied are in actual fact ‘subjects’ that produce explanations of their world (Ekanem, 2007). It includes the evaluation of respondents’ perceptions of any given subject matter. For instance, it included the detailed accounts of organisational leaders themselves, integrating their perceptions of what they consider as effective leadership and how leadership relates to organisational factors as employee performance, job satisfaction, etc.

This study deployed the use of the qualitative research strategy. This was done through design of semi-structured interviews. These interviews were conducted with business leaders. The reason for adopting the qualitative research strategy was that this study was set to achieve more than measurable evidence obtained from quantitative research strategy. Since the inductive reasoning approach was engaged in this study, the qualitative research strategy was useful in providing more detail to the already gathered facts, as the researcher had the opportunity to observe behavioural responses. The qualitative research strategy was also employed in this study to enable participants have a greater sense of freedom to share their responses.

However, quantitative research is different from qualitative research in a number of aspects. In the first instance, there are differences in the principal orientation of the role
of theory in relation to research. Whereas the quantitative research strategy is constructed on a deductive approach that of the qualitative research strategy is constructed on an inductive approach. Another difference can be confirmed from the perspective of epistemological orientation. Qualitative research has an epistemological orientation that approves the rules of the model of natural sciences and a positivism paradigm. On the contrary, qualitative research embraces an epistemological orientation of interpretivism.

Furthermore, while the quantitative research strategy adopts objectivism as its ontological orientation, the qualitative research strategy assumes subjectivism or constructivism (also called constructionism) as its ontological orientation. This study utilised both ontological orientations to provide a robust understanding of the research problem in order to add new knowledge.

Because the current research evolves on the leadership phenomenon and is also utilising the qualitative research strategy, it would thereby explore understanding of qualitative research that relates to leadership studies in the next section.

6.5.2 Divergent perspectives of Qualitative leadership research

More recently, literature has emerged that provides contradictory findings to what was regarded as the norm of leadership research. Before now, it was common ground for the majority of research on leadership to be centralised on the leader and adopt a psychological orientation with the use of quantitative and survey-based methods (Lowe and Gardner, 2001). According to Klenke (2008), (2016); this status quo is attributed to the supremacy of the positivism paradigm at the time.
He therefore stated that,

“Leadership research has been grounded in the objectivist, positivist, quantitative paradigm” (p.3) and “This will continue to be the case as long as the widespread conviction persist that only quantitative data are ultimately valid and of high quality.” (p.5).

Prior to Klenke’s premise, Alvesson (1996, p.455) asserted that there has been a resilient discontent with conventional approaches to leadership research that have been controlled by positivistic and neo-positivistic assumptions and strategies. He argued that the results of leadership research through the use of quantitative research over the year were inadequate and restated the need for new approaches.

There have been other researchers advocating for or against the implementation of qualitative research in leadership study. Bryman, Stephens and Campo (1996) predicted that quantitative research would continue to have a dominant methodological position within the leadership field and expressed doubt over qualitative research breaking ground. However, Conger (1998) contended with the existing notion by suggesting that qualitative research was set to become the cardinal methodology in understanding and interpreting leadership from a multi-level, dynamic and symbolic context.

Bryman (2004) pointed to the rise of qualitative leadership research since the 1990’s, especially the use of interviewing and stated that, “qualitative research on leadership has greatly enhanced our appreciation of the significance of leaders as makers of meaning; an aspect of leadership that is difficult to gain access to through quantitative investigations” (Bryman 2004, p. 750). However, a major challenge for qualitative research is its inability to establish the kind of criteria adopted by quantitative research which allows room for testing of variables to prove validity and reliability.

Even though the quantitative and qualitative research strategies are the two widely held research strategies employed in the research process, there is a third research strategy
that is gradually gaining momentum. It is referred to as the mixed method because it represents a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. Since this current research has adopted the mixed methods strategy it has become imperative that the succeeding section would explore the mixed methods research strategy.

6.5.3 Mixed methods Research Strategy

In an attempt to describe the mixed methods research strategy, Creswell and Plano Clark (2007, p. 5) stated:

“Mixed methods research is a research design with philosophical assumption as well as methods of inquiry. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases of the research process. As a method, it focuses on collecting, analysing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or series of studies. Its central premise is that the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches, in combination, provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone.”

The mixed methods strategy has no anticipation to replace quantitative and qualitative approaches but to rather utilise the pros and neglect the cons of the two approaches (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). What then are the advantages of the mixed methods research? There are a number of advantages of the mixed methods research. According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2011), the mixed methods strategy counterbalances the disadvantages of both quantitative and qualitative research. Another merit of mixed methods research is that the collaboration of both methods equips the study with more evidence. There are critical questions of the research that the mixed methods would help to provide answers to effectively. There are also suggestions that the mixed methods approach would enhance the generalizability of the research findings (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2009).

This study conducted the mixed methods research strategy by critically collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data based on the research questions. This was
followed by concurrently integrating the quantitative and qualitative data. This study employed a triangulation approach of the mixed methods research strategy. This was because the triangulation process made it possible for the study to use qualitative research to support the findings from the quantitative research (Hammersley, 1996). In agreement with Bryman and Bell’s (2007) finding, the triangulation approach to limit bias that may be present in research and thus enhance a more impartial and independent research.

In conclusion, this research utilises a mixed methods research strategy. Empirical data were collected through the use of questionnaire survey and semi-structured interviews. This study adopts the data triangulation which simply refers to the collection of data from diverse sources to study the leadership phenomenon.

6.6 Methods of Data Collection

Data collection is imperative in any given research study. The primary notion of data collection is that it obtains information to answer the questions asked in the research. Data are universally of two categories; namely primary and secondary data. Primary data refers to data derived from original sources, such as interviews, surveys and experiments (Collis and Hussey, 2009).

The rationale behind the collection of primary data is that it is used to test the hypotheses generated from the research. Whereas, secondary data represents readily available sources such as databases and publications. Secondary data can be classified into three major types namely, documentary data, survey-based data and data collected from multiple sources (Lewis, Thornhill and Saunders, 2007). The procedure for data collection in mixed methods research includes vital elements: sampling, gaining permissions, gathering data, recording the data and administering the data collection.
The current study engaged a single technique of quantitative data collection known as surveys through the aid of questionnaires. The questionnaire is a very common data collection method in the social science discipline. It is defined as a survey that enables participants provide answers to questions in the absence of intervention from the researcher (Bryman and Bell, 2011). In this research, self-administered questionnaires were completed by respondents.

Although Robson (2002) recommended the use of questionnaires as a veritable data collection too because it protects the confidentiality of respondents. He also argued that the major limitation to questionnaires is that the researcher does not have control of the response rates. However, this study gathered an equitable response rate which indicates a high number of responses necessary for discussing the findings of the research.

This research employed semi-structured interviews with a sample from the research population who accepted to be interviewed. In as much as the researcher had an interview guide with a list of open questions, it did not always follow corresponding order because of the responses of the interviewees. The successive section would briefly explain two essential elements of this research; known as research population and research sample.

### 6.6.1 Research Population

In the collection of primary data, it is essential to clarify what the research population is. According to Bryman (2008), the research population can be defined as “the universe of units from which a sample is to be selected”. This research will partially take into cognizance the definition of Collis and Hussey (2009) that research population represents a defined body of people or objects being investigated for statistical purposes. The reason for the partial adoption is because the definition by Collis and
Hussey does not bring to light the qualitative aspects of research, considering that this study is a mixed methods research. Moreover, the research population for this study was the employees of private sector companies in the Abuja, which the federal capital of Nigeria. In consequence of this, the research population provided the base of this study’s research sample.

6.6.2 Research Sample

It is necessary for a sample to be selected from a research population. There are sampling techniques that inform this selection process. This research utilised a purposive sampling technique. This is a sampling technique that requires the researchers to use his or her own judgement in the selection of samples that are most appropriate in providing answers to the research objectives and questions. (Saunders and Lewis, 2012). Under the purposive sampling technique, this research deployed the maximal variation sampling method which is one in which individuals selected are expected to hold diverse perspectives of the central phenomenon being investigated.

Factors such as gender, age, work experience and staff positions, just to mention a few were of vital consideration. The use of the purposive sampling technique in this research was because it provides sufficient justification that enables the researcher make generalisations from the sample being studied and it gives room for more flexibility while sampling.

In this study, questionnaires were administered to 394 respondents across ten private sector companies. These companies were small and medium scale companies (that is, with a population of 5-150 employees). These companies represented the following sectors in Nigeria: Consulting, Education, Estate & Property, Furniture and Carpentry Services, Hospitality, HR, Information and Communications Technology, Technology, Telecommunications and Training and Development. However, of the 394 employees
that received the questionnaires, the actual response received was from 285 respondents which led to a response rate of 72.3%. The questionnaires were distributed to employees at different staff positions of the private companies as mentioned above from different sectors of industry to develop a robust perspective of what their perceptions of Servant-Leadership is. In addition, this research is not a case study of a particular industry.

The questions developed for the interview addressed the research questions and objectives of the study.

6.6.2.1 Measurements and Measures

This research identified several variables that needed to be examined and measured. They included:

i. Leadership characteristics,

ii. Job satisfaction,

iii. Organisational Citizenship Behaviour,

iv. Organisational culture,

v. Ubuntu, and

vi. Employee Performance

To achieve this, it made use of the following tools that informed the development of the questionnaire surveys and semi-structured interviews:

i. Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) - Barbuto and Wheeler, (2006) used in studies by {Avolio and Walumbwa, 2009; and Van Dierendonck, 2011}

ii. Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) – Dennis and Bocarnea, (2004) used in studies by {Carroll and Patterson, 2016}

iii. Revised Servant Leadership Profile (RSLP)- Wong and Page, (2003) used by {Parris and Peachey, 2013; and Sun, 2013}
iv. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) - Howell and Avolio, (1993) used in a study by {Peterson, Galvin and Lange, 2012}.

v. The GLOBE project (Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness) - House et al., (2004); Hofstede (2006), used in studies by {Klenke, 2016; and Northouse, 2017}

vi. The Ubuntu Scale (Brubaker, 2013) used in a study by {Lituchy, Ford and Punnett, 2013}

There are various methods available for the researcher through which survey research can be conducted (Fowler, 2013). Moreover, Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Jackson (2015) asserted that the conduct of surveys could sometimes be rigorous and time-consuming. To design the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, this research employed the use of the various measures of already established assessment instruments that are relevant to this study.

For example, items 01, 05,16,27,35, 36-47 of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) informed the design of statements A8-B5 of this study’s questionnaire. There was also a consideration of the five correlated first-order factors (transformational leadership, contingent reward, active management-by-exception, passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire leadership of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

In addition, this study explored the 42 scale item of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) that were dependent on the following five factors: love, humility, empowerment, vision and trust. This led to the formulation of statements A1, A2, A3, A4, B6, and B9-B13. Similarly, items 1, 10, 61, 72 and 77 of the Revised Servant Leadership Profile were a useful resource in developing the entire Section 2 of the questionnaire and statements C6, C13, and E2-E9 which reflected on culture, leader behaviours and employee outcomes. This research also developed its questions from
Hofstede model of six dimensions of national cultures namely: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, long/short term orientation and indulgence/restraint. Although the GLOBE Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness) project focused on cross-cultural leadership, a general understudy of its report on Sub-Saharan African (SSA) culture provided the school of thought in which the section; a diagnostic analysis of the element of culture was designed. Following this, items 1-12 of the Ubuntu scale informed the formation of D1-D10 of the questionnaire.

6.7 Pilot Study

Certain aspects of the pilot test of the questionnaire was undertaken within the Abertay University Business School. Other aspects were conducted in Amazon, Fairmont Hotel, SGL private security and Interra Networks Limited. Initially, questionnaires were sent to other doctoral researchers of the Business School to determine if the questions were easy to comprehend. Secondly, questionnaires were forwarded to junior and senior staff of the companies listed above. Four senior managers and six junior employees took part in the pilot study. Upon receiving the questionnaires, the need to revise the section on culture was raised. After resolving this issue, the questionnaire was formally designed into five sections leading to a total of 74 questions.

Cronbach alpha was used in this study to test and improve the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. For reliability, the minimum value that was derived as acceptable was $> 0.7$. In relation to validity, the acceptable values of item-item correlation and item-total correlation was $> 0.3$ and $> 0.5$ respectively. These results are provided in Table 6.1 below:
Table 6.1: Overview of reliability and internal consistency measures from the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Measure of reliability</th>
<th>Item-item correlation</th>
<th>Measure of item-item correlation</th>
<th>Item-item correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership style</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.02-0.805</td>
<td>Small to large</td>
<td>0.315-0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership Characteristics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.058-0.843</td>
<td>Small to large</td>
<td>0.469-0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.407-0.729</td>
<td>Medium to large</td>
<td>0.528-0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Citizenship Behaviour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.311-0.62</td>
<td>Medium to large</td>
<td>0.551-0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.529-0.85</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>0.648-0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.03-0.668</td>
<td>Small to large</td>
<td>0.268-0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.526-0.79</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>0.642-0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation

Table 6.2: Justification for selecting the companies studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement for Justification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Category</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company size</td>
<td>Small and Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Business</td>
<td>Services, Construction/Real Estate, Information &amp; Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Edge</td>
<td>Business in existence for $\geq 8$ years Award winning companies Very innovative companies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the researcher
6.8 Data Collection

6.8.1 Questionnaire Process

This study deployed the framework by Churchill and Iacobacci (2002) questionnaire development process which consists of the following nine steps:

I. Specify what information will be sought
II. Determine the types of questionnaire and methods for administration
III. Content of individual items
IV. Determine form of response
V. Determine wording of each question
VI. Determine the sequence of questions
VII. Determine layout and physical characteristics of the questionnaire
VIII. Re-examine steps i-vii above, if necessary
IX. Pre-test questionnaire

For this research, the followers were employees of the ten private sector companies studied while 6 CEOs, 5 MD (Managing Directors), 4 General Managers, 3 Heads of units/departments, and 2 principal consultants represented the twenty (20) business leaders interviewed.

The categorisation of the questions as seen in the questionnaire was dependent on those from whose studies questions were developed. This confirmed that their theoretical underpinnings of the measured constructs were maintained. As a result, the general presentation, format and layout of the questionnaire were such that the flow is in a logical sequence when moving from one topic to another.
Furthermore, a covering for the questionnaire was attached and introduced to the survey. The covering letter clarified on the purpose of the survey and stated that it had been approved by the ethical committee of the University. In addition, the covering letter stated that respondents information derived through the survey would be confidentially kept and the anonymity of participants maintained strictly.

The structure of the questionnaire was such that the questions were divided into four sections and a Likert-scale was used. The 5-Likert scale would be represented as the following; 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree. Furthermore, questionnaires were self-administered mostly through the use of the human resources/administrative departments of all the companies studied.

6.8.2 Interviews

The initial target for interviews was thirty-five business leaders across the ten companies studied. However, due to privacy concerns and the withdrawal of scheduled appointments, only twenty business leaders were successfully interviewed. The process for the interviews commenced with sending covering letters of interest indicating the purpose of the study. Follow up calls were made to the business leaders and scheduled dates were granted. They were four business leaders who rescheduled their interviews but were eventually interviewed. The use of a data recorder was an active part in gathering feedback from the interviews.

6.9 Data Analysis

Quantitative data from the questionnaires were analysed through the use of the SPSS version 23. SPSS statistics is a statistical package that helps to analyse highly complex by generating statistical reports that are easy to interpret (George and Mallery, 2016). Frequency distributions and the Pearson’s correlation matrix was used to analyse
quantitative data. A thematic content analysis was used to analyse the interviews. For hypothesis 1, the dependent variables include all the characteristics of servant leadership which are listening, empathy, emotional healing, persuasion, awareness, foresight, conceptualization, stewardship, growth and community building, vision while leadership effectiveness is the independent variable. For hypothesis 2, in the questionnaire, Gender, Age, Work Experience and Positions constitute the dependent variables. On the other hand, servant leadership represents the independent variable and factors as, job satisfaction, and organisational citizenship behaviour and employee performance represent possible outcomes to be tested. For example, organisational citizenship behaviour is the possible outcome and is analysed through the following mediating variables: (1) helping behaviours, (2) empathy, (3) organisational loyalty, (4) individual initiative, (5) self-development and (6) organisational compliance (Mc Neely and Meglino, 1994; Podaskoff et al., 2000). Statements were synthesized and responses from questionnaires and interviews were analysed to develop the findings.

For hypothesis 3, servant leadership represents the independent variable, while Culture is provided as the dependent variable. The 18 synthesized statements represent the mediating variables which bring about the effect of culture within an organisation.

For hypothesis 4, Q65 to Q74 were synthesized and the results of the findings are presented. This study investigates that tests provided for Hypothesis 1 to 3, would help to inform the test of Hypothesis 4.

6.10 Observation

In the course of this study, the researcher had the privilege to observe a meeting the business leaders in a company. This helped to shed more light into the leadership culture in Nigerian private sector companies was during an observation by the researcher. This observation process involved a strategy meeting with the Chief
Executive Officer (CEO) and 4 Heads of Units in one of the studied companies. The strategy meeting started with the CEO introducing a project he wanted the company to embark upon. As an observer, the researcher noticed how the CEO spoke for over 40 minutes explaining how the project would be handled and ended by delegating roles. Considering the fact that this was an entirely novel idea, there was no part in the meeting where the CEO requested for ideas from the Heads of Units. In addition, he made no inquiry to ascertain whether these HOD’s (who are also leaders of teams) had the necessary knowledge and skillsets to achieve THE BIG VISION.

6.11 Ethical Consideration

Harris and Atkinson (2013) noted that the significance of ethical approval cannot be overstated and therefore should not be taken for granted in the body of research. Gregory (2003) argued that while research refers to a species of findings to carried, such findings must be undertaken with ethical considerations. Following this, Saunders and Lewis (2012) describe ethics as the ability of the researcher to conform to the values, norms and regulations that govern and protect the stakeholders within the research environment.

Earlier, Bryman (2006) emphasised on the importance of looking at ethical issues involving management research especially as it involves responses from human resources within an organisation. Based on this, the researcher sent in an application for ethical approval to the ethics committee of the Dundee Business School (DBS), Abertay University. Upon review and receipt of a letter of approval by the committee, the researcher then proceeded for data collection in Nigeria. The university’s ethical approval letter was shown to the HR managers whose employees’ participated and the twenty business leaders interviewed to assure them of how much emphasis the
researcher had placed on protecting their anonymity (if they so desired) and ensuring that information given was treated with strict confidentiality.

6.12 Conclusion

This chapter has described the adopted and implemented research methodology. It has shown the philosophical perspectives of the research methodology from the epistemological and ontological constructs of this research. In addition, it indicated the various research methods, design, strategy and data analysis approaches it deployed and the justification behind the selection of such methods.
Chapter Seven: Analysis and Presentation of the Findings.

7.1 Introduction

The primary objective of this chapter is to present the findings from the analysis of the data collected from the questionnaires and interviews. The data analysis from 285 valid questionnaires are represented with the use of means, standard deviations and charts that are dependent upon a 5-point Likert scale. This chapter also presents the findings from the interviews conducted with 14 male and 6 female leaders. It is divided into seven sections.

The first section shows the demographic profiles of the respondents. It presents a statistical breakdown of the respondents’ profiles by looking at gender, age, work experience and current staff positions. The second section represents the findings that relate to the first hypothesis which seeks to investigate the relationship that exists between servant leadership characteristics/or personal leader traits of a servant leader such as Listening, Empathy, Healing, Awareness, Persuasion, Conceptualization, Foresight, Stewardship, Commitment to the growth of people and Building community and the perceptions employees’ have of what they consider to be leadership effectiveness.

The third section is a representation of the findings that relate to the second hypothesis on demographic variables (Gender, Age, Work Experience and Staff Positions) and the application of servant leadership on job satisfaction. While the fourth section presents the findings in relation to the third hypothesis on culture and servant leadership, the fifth
section presents findings in relation to the final hypothesis on servant leadership and employee performance. The sixth section concludes the chapter with a summary of the main findings.

7.2 Respondents' Profiles

Of all the 285 valid questionnaires obtained for data analysis, 182 were from male and 103 were from female respondents. This makes a representation of 64% males and 36% females.

Table 7.2.1: Respondents Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience (Years)</td>
<td>1-11(months)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 and above</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Positions</td>
<td>Junior Level</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Level</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Level</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation

Table 7.2.1 above shows the findings of the data collected that relates to the age group of the respondents. It can be seen that out of 285 respondents, the minority of the respondents are above 45 years old. It also indicates that the majority of the respondents are a younger generation of less than 45 years old. This reveals that the dominant age group of workforce in Nigerian private sector companies are of a younger generation and are likely to be in lower and middle management positions in their companies. For that reason, a small number of the respondents are middle-aged of
more than 45 but less than 56 years old, while a very low number of them are older respondents aged more than 56 years. The fact that the retirement age of employees in the Nigerian private sector is 65 years reflects why there was no respondent who was aged over 65 years. In view of this, it is most probable that senior and executive management are represented by employees who have experienced career growth on the organisational chart and have spent more working years within their companies. This suggests that most of the respondents in senior level positions are aged between 45 to 65 years.

It can be seen from Table 7.2.1 below that of 285 respondents, only six (6) indicated their work experience to be between 1-11 months, while 44 had worked for 1-3 years. Also, a high number of 200 respondents indicated that their work experience was 4-7 years, while 35 respondents indicated 8 years and above. This confirms the above age distribution of the respondents. It means that the majority of the respondents have been in their positions with their organisations for less than 7 years. However, the minority of the respondents have been in their positions for less than 3 years or for 8 years and above.

Table 7.2.1 indicates that a large number of respondents were within the junior level to middle level staff positions in their organisations, being 128 (45%) and 121 (42.6%) respectively, and only 36 respondents (12.4%) were senior level employees (consisting of all in managerial positions from junior management to top management (TM) employees). It confirms the previous statistical analysis that the majority of the respondents are young and in junior and middle level ranking positions. Furthermore, this implies that the respondents in senior level positions have been in their organisations for more than 4 years and this could be the reason for their career progression.
7.3 Servant Leadership Characteristics and Employees’ Perceptions of Leadership Effectiveness

The hypothesis that will be tested here is to ascertain if there is a significant correlation between servant leadership characteristics/personal traits of a servant leader and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness. This section therefore, provides the results of the questionnaire and the interviews on the relationship between Servant Leadership characteristics and Leadership Effectiveness. The hypothesis being tested is:

$H_1$: There is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/personal leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Undecided (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (a) Listening</td>
<td>My views and complaints are always listened to</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Listening</td>
<td>I have developed a close working relationship with my manager</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Empathy</td>
<td>I do not hesitate to approach my manager if I have a personal problem</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Awareness</td>
<td>I am sure my manager understands what the company’s goals are</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conceptualization</td>
<td>I see my manager as one who can think out of the box and develop new ideas to solve problems</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vision</td>
<td>I see my manager as a leader with vision</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Awareness</td>
<td>I see my manager as one who has full awareness of what is going on in the company</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Commitment to the Growth of People</td>
<td>There are many times when my manager puts my interest before his/her own</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Commitment to the Growth of People</td>
<td>I am given the opportunity to make decisions.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stewardship</td>
<td>My manager takes the blame for a task which I was responsible for and corrects me later</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Building Community</td>
<td>I feel left out of the team</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Persuasion</td>
<td>My manager encourages myself and team members to think of innovative solutions that would lead us towards our unit’s objective</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Commitment to the Growth of People</td>
<td>I am convinced that my manager wants me to reach my best potential in life, and not just as it relates to work.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Stewardship</td>
<td>My manager acknowledges the team for a job well done and not himself/herself</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Healing</td>
<td>I receive a great sense of encouragement and moral support from my manager</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Empathy</td>
<td>I feel threatened at feedback sessions I have with my manager</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Commitment to the Growth of People</td>
<td>I have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation I received from my manager</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Stewardship</td>
<td>My manager thinks of himself first before anyone else</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Stewardship</td>
<td>I see my manager as one who is more keen on protecting his own interests than that of the team</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Building Community</td>
<td>I have become a better team member because of the example of my manager</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The low mean scores as seen in Table 7.3.1 above are ranged from 1.0-2.4. The medium mean scores are represented within the range of 2.5-3.4. In addition, high mean scores have a range of 3.5-5.0. This implies that while characteristics as stewardship and commitment to growth had low mean scores, awareness had high scores. Even though the statement “I see my manager as one who is more keen on protecting his own interests than that of the team” had a high mean score of > 3.5, it could still be considered negative in effect.

Table 7.3.1 above reveals that a total of 43.9% of respondents agreed to the statement, “My views and complaints are always listened to”. The statement was disagreed by 28.3% of the respondents. This result indicates that a little less than half of the respondents believed that their views and complaints were listened to, while a small percentage of them felt their complaints were not always listened to. This statement was designed to reflect the servant leadership characteristic of Listening and responses from the interviews on the kind of leadership qualities they possessed or considered as important generated the following responses. Of the 20 business leaders interviewed, 5 of them agreed that they listen to the views and complaints of their employees.

For example, when asked what qualities of leadership they considered to be most important, the CEO of a Technology Software and Services company (Lead 4) said:

Five years ago, I would have listed a completely different set of qualities like determination and focus as most significant to my leadership style. But today, I think communication skills, diplomacy, tact, negotiation are most important.

In response to this same question, the female CEO of an Estate and Property company (Lead 9) that won an award for innovation and excellent team work culture from 2011 to 2016 stated:

In my 14 years of running the company, I see listening to my employees as important to my success as a leader and the success of the organisation in a
whole. I listen a lot to what my employees are saying, and what they are also not saying. This has helped me even personally to a better and caring person.

Accordingly, when the Principal Consultant of a HR outsourcing company (Lead 1) whose company has singlehandedly managed the nationwide recruitment of employees for key federal parastatals was asked the attribute he considered most necessary in working with his employees, he said.

*I would say good communication, and for me, it begins by having a good listening ear. I always try to hear what my employees have to say, because it helps me grow as a leader and over the years, I have seen the reward of listening to the ideas and views of my employees concerning our business.*

In the same way, the female CEO of a Training and Development company (Lead 3) that has been involved in training sales, business development and technical staff for financial and manufacturing companies said:

*My most important attribute as a leader is having a desire to listen. I believe it builds trust. I don’t think there is any employee who would not want to be listened to. Before I became CEO, I had to listen and I haven’t stopped listening to my staff.*

When asked about the measure of freedom employees had to express their views, and if it was important in leadership, the General Manager of a renowned hospitality company (Lead 2) that accommodates international delegates who attend events in Abuja said:

*Yes there is. The HR department is an open door for all staff complaints. For me, I am very comfortable to listen to the complaints of my staff, even to listen to opposing views and helpful suggestions from them regarding our business objectives. This has helped me develop stronger bond with my employees and probably earn their trust at the same time.*

Even though the characteristic of listening was not mentioned by all the interviewees, it can be concluded that there are at least one-quarter of the business leaders interviewed who associate the impact of listening to their effectiveness as leaders. Moreover, a significant percentage of the respondents (62.1%) agreed to the statement, “*I do not hesitate to approach my manager if I have a personal problem*”. On the contrary, a
small percentage of 19.1% disagreed, while 18.1% remained undecided. These results reveal that the majority of employees at different staff positions thought that their managers were easily approachable when they faced personal problems. This statement was designed to reflect employees’ perception of the servant leadership characteristic of Empathy and Healing. Correspondingly, findings from the interviews reveal that 7 out of 20 business leaders interviewed believed that empathy and healing were desired leaders’ attributes for leadership effectiveness. For example, the General Manager of an ICT (Information and Communication Technology) company (Lead 5) with its headquarters in Abuja and 2 other branches in Lagos and Port Harcourt remarked:

*I am the kind of leader that allows my people to come in and tell me their problems. I like to help my people even beyond office work, so that they are happy at work.

Similarly, the following question was asked. In what ways do you ensure a good working relationship with your employees? In response to this question, the Head of Sales (Lead 10), in the northern region of another technology company whose business operations expand to the western and eastern regions of Nigeria confidently stated:

*I think I have developed a very, very close relationship with my employees. I make efforts to know them personally. I think I want to always the leader my employees can count on during difficult times. You would not believe the number of personal issues I get to deal with which do not relate to the job or the company. We all face hard times and I am the leader who is there for my employees during such times. This I guess, has improved my relationship with my employees.

Furthermore, in providing answers to the same question above, the Managing Director (Lead 16) of a large factory involved in furniture and carpentry services with a production line of 120 employees said:

*I know that if my employees are not in a good state of mind, it would affect their productivity on the job. I am very close to my employees, close enough to give them that freedom to share what affects them personally and I always encourage my supervisors and factory managers to do the same. The nature of our job is very demanding, and I always try to remind myself and my junior managers that
we must put the interest of our employees before profits. In the culture of my company, I make sure we try to assist employees as much as we can.

Similarly, still in response to the question, in what ways do you ensure a good working relationship with your employees? The Head of Human Resources Department in the hospitality company (Lead 13) previously mentioned enthusiastically stated:

_Hmmmmn. Is this an examination? I am just joking. Well, I would say, that I ensure a good working relationship with my employees by first understanding them better. In my 8 years as a HR practitioner and 5 years in charge of human resources in this hotel, I have learned that the more I know an employee, the better I can work better with him or her. But to make this happen, I take out time to find out if they have problems within the company and what the HR department can do. I am also interested in what concerns them beyond the affairs of the company._

Also, Lead 11 who is the Head of Academic Affairs in a private university that is providing distinctive quality-based education in Nigeria since its inception in 2011 had this to say:

_I lead my team is by first being approachable and promoting a work environment where problems are shared and solved collectively. I am of the opinion that this has promoted a good and professional work relationship in my team._

Having shared his thoughts on how he was able to grow the company from start and how some pioneer and new employees see the company as theirs too, the Principal Consultant of a consulting company (Lead 6) was asked how he has been able to reduce turnover and maintain a sustainable staff strength (just as he had implied), he stated:

_Experience has taught me that focusing on employees’ concerns improves me as a leader and develops trust within the organisation. In my company, we look out for each other. In my 13 years and 8 months of leading this company, I have seen employees come and go and sometimes I am shocked at what they go through. You would be amazed at what some employees are facing in their personal lives. I have an open door policy and my heart is also open to help employees’ resolves personal issues._

After a little hesitation, when asked about if the company had a policy that supported employees facing very hard challenges, the CEO of an ICT company (Lead 7) involved in diversified communication services with 3 offices in Nigeria said:
In my company, we have a motto that “a happy staff is a productive staff”. As individuals, we all face challenges at certain times and I see it as my duty to help my team when they encounter personal challenges. The reason I do this is because I have seen employees lose their motivation to work because of a loss of a family member, inability to pay a child’s schooling fees on time or one major problem at a particular time. When I get involved in their problem, I believe they see our company as a caring company.

However, in response to the same question just above, there was a sharp contrast with the response the General Manager of the Estate and Property Company (Lead 8) previously mentioned. His response not correspond with others on the servant leadership characteristic of empathy and healing. He stated very ardently:

*I work very hard myself and demand hard work from all my staff regardless of their position. From experience, I do not like when staff keep coming with personal issues, like today, my wife had an accident and tomorrow my son was sent away from school. I know how staff work and some people are just lazy and keep giving excuses for not working hard. I think issues must be treated at home and when we come to work, let us all work. I am not being wicked and my people know what I stand for and how I work hard. I just work with facts. I give you a good example. A driver came to my office a few years ago and told me how he and his family were sent packing by the landlord because they had no money. I told the accountant to give him financial support. That same evening, I saw him drinking on the street while I was driving home, so I know how staff work most of the time.*

The evidence from this analysis suggests that there are contradictory views across the business leaders on the significance of empathy and healing to leadership effectiveness.

It can also be seen from Table 7.3.1 that approximately two-thirds of the respondents (65.2 %) agreed to the statement, “I see my manager as one who can think out of the box and develop new ideas to solve problems”. However, a small minority of the respondents (16%) disagreed to the statement. In response to a similar statement, “I see my manager as a leader with vision”, a very significant of the respondents (83.3%) agreed, while an insignificant number of respondents (9.8%) disagreed.
Both statements above relate to the servant leadership characteristics of Conceptualisation and Vision. The results from these statements affirm that a high majority of respondents (83.9%) across all staff positions believed that their business leaders had foresight and vision. This finding indicates that 6 out of the 20 business leaders interviewed agreed on how vision and foresight were important characteristics of their leadership. For instance, the General Manager of a very innovative technology and software company willingly commented,

*For me, vision is my most important quality. As a leader, I see what my team does not see. Before every meeting I have with my team, I spend a lot of time thinking critically of answers to likely questions they would ask.*

It is interesting to note that the Managing Director (Lead 15) of student recruitment of a very large private educational institution when asked how he saw himself as a leader unhurriedly asserted:

*Well, as a visionary leader. I see myself as a leader who has the zeal and ability to develop a unique vision for this institution. In overseeing student recruitment services, I need to develop plans on how to bring in good students into the university. But I know that I cannot do this alone, so I develop a plan and share with my team. I and my team are regularly involved in educational exhibitions across the country. We go in search of the best and brightest students to come here. This for me needs a lot of my vision and the support of my team. Recently, I build a strategic partnership with the Turkish international school here in Abuja.*

When asked what leadership attribute he considered most important in decision-making, the Managing Director and joint owner of the ICT Company mentioned above (Lead 14) unequivocally stated:

*For me personally, I would say that foresight is my most significant attribute in making decisions. As a leader, I believe my thinking should always be ahead of my staff. I say foresight because it’s one thing to start a business, while it’s another to keep it sustained. My ability to demonstrate foresight has helped my company grow in revenue.*

A very engaging interview ensued with the CEO and Chairman of the HR outsourcing company who after his education at Imperial College in 2005 and working as the Head
of Human Resources Department of two major banks in Nigeria decided to venture into his own business enterprise. In response to the same question on what leadership attribute he considered most important in decision-making? the CEO and Chairman of this HR outsourcing company that is involved in large-scale outsourcing service delivery (Lead 17) after pondering for a while said:

That’s a tough question to ask because the scope of what my company does is driven by intellectual competence and decisions are not easy sometimes because our bespoke services are customised to meet each client’s needs. But I would say that….. (pauses), having a dream and persuading my team till they own the dream is the most significant element for me as a leader and in my company as a whole. In my company, we have a culture where we dream big, but we all dream together.

When asked to identify the most important leadership trait that he uses in making employees understand the company goals, the CEO of a telecommunications company (Lead 18) asserted:

I would say vision and having the desire to learn beyond what I already know. I think I am more concerned about how I lead now than when I started this company just 9 years ago. I see myself as a leader who sees beyond today in order to keep the company moving forward. My desire to learn new ways of leading my employees’ helps me lead them effectively. I try to be an open book and I believe this helps to put me and my employees of where the company is going.

The same question was asked to Lead 20 who the Managing Director of the consulting company is whose services across Nigeria include business development services, recruitment services, and training and workshops. She made this remark:

My business would not have grown to where it is today if I did not have vision as a leader. We have grown to become a top brand in the consulting industry and have built some strategic alliances with training firms in Dubai and London. I believe had to do with vision and my ability to believe the vision makes it easier to communicate the vision. Six years ago, I saw what our competitors did not see on time within our business space and with my vision, myself and my staff were able to innovate certain services that have increased our client base till date.

Moreover, Table 7.3.1 above compares the data illustrated with the use of two statements to reflect on employees’ perceptions of the servant leadership characteristic
of Awareness. The first statement, “I am sure my manager understands what the company’s goals are”, showed that a very significant number of respondents (72.4%) agreed. Similarly, the second statement “I see my manager as one who has full awareness of what is going on in the company” 63.4% agreed while 11.2% disagreed and 25.5% were undecided. This means that the majority of the respondents accept their managers mindfulness of what was going on within the company. These results support the answers from 4 of the business leaders interviewed were asked whether they had full awareness of the company and their employees. For example, Lead 4 emphasised:

As the owner and Chief Executive Officer of this company, I see myself as its first employee. I endeavour to be fully conscious of what is happening in my company. This helps me guide my team better.

Without hesitation, the General Manager of a fast-growing telecommunications company (Lead 12) answered the questions by stating:

For the past 6 years, I have not stopped being the last to leave the office. What my staff do not know is that when they close and go home at 5pm that is just when my work begins. I take out time to review all my emails, reports, appraise the current state of our existing bids and just know where we are as a company.

In responding to this same question, the Head of Human Resources Department (Lead 13) of a five star hotel in Abuja stated:

I am very aware of where the company is and is going and I try to let my employees know. Also, I am concerned about what employees think of the company, so I take out time to check the Anonymous Drop Box we have in the company, where employees can drop a note for me, if they do not want to discuss in person.

Similarly, the Principal Consultant of a vibrant HR outsourcing company (Lead 1) asserted:

The nature of my business makes me travel out of the country a lot, so I am always in correspondence with my managers and supervisors on all matters affecting the company. There are times junior employees are shocked about how
much I know even when I was away. I believe it makes them feel their leader is concerned about what affects them within the company.

Noteworthy differences were found when analysing the findings from the statement “My manager encourages myself and team members to think of innovative solutions that would lead us towards our unit’s objective”. To this statement, a total of 32.6% of respondents agreed, 49.5% disagreed and 17.9% were undecided. The statement above was constructed to ascertain the extent to which business leaders utilised the servant leadership characteristic of Persuasion in achieving organisational goals. This finding is in contradiction with the responses given by 5 out of 20 business leaders interviewed. A case in point was when Lead 9 commented on his leadership style by stating:

I personally see myself as a leader and not a manager because I set trends for others to follow, rather than only managing day to day activities. I like to lead by getting people on board, developing a vision, selling the vision which to me is very important and supporting my staff in achieving that vision.

When asked who the active participants of decision-making in the company were, it more interesting to observe Lead 14 who after pausing for a while remarked:

Even though I have the final authority in my company, I make efforts to convince my employees on why they should approve of certain ideas I desire we implement as a company. I do not force them.

To provide an illustration of her viewpoint, the female Managing Director of a technology company (Lead 19) pointed to a picture that was taken at a team bonding event and stated:

My leadership is such that I try to break away from the old patterns of leadership where leaders were in the habit of using force and threats. I use a lot of convincing and open communication to demand results from them.

The following quotation was made by Lead 17 to represent his answer to the question:
I come from the school of thought that leadership is about influence and that does not come by means of commands. I like to carry my employees along and motivate them on why we must achieve certain organisational goals or objectives.

The concluding response that was significantly related to the servant leadership characteristic of persuasion was given by Lead 15 who stated:

In my years of 11 years of leading employees, I have learnt that employees work better when they feel they play a major role in achieving a goal, rather than being forced. I take out time to explain to them certain advancements the company would intend to make or changes and I solicit their support. At the same time, I ask for contrary views and suggestions that are constructive.

The results from Table 7.3.1 above show that about half of the respondents felt they lacked encouragement from their leaders towards self-development of innovative solutions to meet company objectives. In addition, their responses indicated that even though they believed their leaders had vision as aforementioned, they thought that their leaders still did not demonstrate the ability to persuade them to achieve the vision through their own creative ideas. These results demonstrate a possible gap in terms of the employees’ personal growth, because it apparently reveals that the employees feel more coerced to carry out their job activities than persuaded as claimed by a quarter of the business leaders interviewed.

To determine the respondents’ perceptions of the servant leadership characteristic of Stewardship, the statement “I see my manager as one who is more keen on protecting his/her own interests than that of the team” was posed. The findings indicate that a very significant number of respondents (71.6%) agreed. Correspondingly, a significant number of respondents (61.9%) agreed to the statement, “My manager thinks of himself first before anyone else”.

However, a small majority of the respondents (25.2%) disagreed to the opinion that their managers think of themselves first before anyone else, while 12.9% of the respondents were undecided. Also, when asked this statement “I receive a great sense of
encouragement and moral support from my manager” a small number of respondents (19.7%) agreed, while a significant number of respondents (57.8%) disagreed. We can deduct from the above results that a high number of respondents upheld a dominant notion that their leaders did not demonstrate selfless service through their leadership styles. The lack of stewardship also proved itself in the inability of the business leaders interviewed to provide encouragement and moral support to their employees’. Contrary to the responses above, 5 business leaders emphasised their commitment to putting the interest of their followers before their personal interests. For instance, when asked on how they relate their leadership to employee morale and engagement, the Principal Consultant of a HR outsourcing company (Lead 1) responded this way:

I put the concerns of my people first because I believe that a lot of private organisations in Nigeria are going down not necessarily due to process problems, but because of people problems.

Another remark to the same question was given by Lead 4 who has been the CEO of a Technology Software and Services Company that has won innovative awards in technology in Nigeria:

I know that this company would not exist without my people. I try to make personal efforts to see that I put their needs before my personal needs, because if my employees do not have enough motivation for their jobs, they cannot give their best.

To demonstrate his answer to this question, the Principal Consultant of a consulting company (Lead 6) that is seeking to diversify into waste management services in 2019 asserted:

The motivation of my employees is very important to me as their leader, but also for the general good of the company. I do not mind going an extra mile to see that my employees are motivated and enjoy their work, no matter the cost.

For the most part of the interview, the CEO of the Estate and Property Company (Lead 9) that is responsible in the management of notable estates in Nigeria stated was
exuberant in responding to the questions. However, in responding to this question, he appeared to take some time to ponder and simply stated:

   For me, I try to put myself in the shoes of my employees to know what they feel, how they are getting on with the job and if there is anything I can do differently.

There was no dull moment in interviewing the CEO and Chairman of a HR outsourcing company in Nigeria that had carved a niche for itself in the delivery of its services. He had a lot to share about his personal experiences with employees. However, in responding to the question above Lead 17 commented:

   I lead sacrificially because from my own experience, I have learnt that it makes the employees trust me as a leader and the company too.

Even though the implications of these findings would be discussed in the next chapter, it is noteworthy to review the major findings so far. The above revealed that business leaders in the Nigerian private sector have a greater inclination to demonstrate Vision, Awareness, Empathy and Healing and a lesser tendency to exhibit Stewardship, Persuasion and Commitment to the Growth of People, Listening and Building Community. Even though the perceptions of the respondents indicate a correlation between servant leadership characteristics and leadership effectiveness, our results cast new light on the absence of these characteristics in relation to current leadership practise in the Nigerian private sector.

The illustration from Appendix 1.1 shows that using a bivariate correlation matrix, a Pearson’s correlation coefficient was conducted to evaluate the alternative hypothesis and ascertain if there is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/person leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership
effectiveness. The strength of the relationship between listening and leadership effectiveness (Q1-Q2) has a high positive correlation of $r=0.096$, which is statistically significant. However, a low level of significance was derived from Q3, as $r=0.009$. Interestingly, after calculating the responses regarding the manager’s level of awareness (Q4), $r=.182^{**}$ when $p<0.01$. This shows a high level of correlation that is statistically significant. For Q5, $r=0.034$ which shows a medium significant level of correlation between vision and leadership effectiveness. The respondents revealed significant levels of correlation on Q7, with $r=0.145^*$ as it reflected the awareness of the manager in relation to leadership effectiveness.

However, there was no statistically significant correlation to demonstrate the servant leadership characteristic of stewardship and leadership effectiveness. This was because, for Q8, $r=-0.019$ which indicates a negative correlation. This shows that stewardship was less likely practiced by managers in Nigerian private sector companies. The results from Q9, $r=.287^{**}$, Q11, $r=.131^*$, Q12, $r=.159^{**}$ and Q13, $r=.123^*$ provide enough evidence to accept the alternative hypothesis as they are statistically significant, and therefore, indicate positive correlations to leadership effectiveness. The applicability of these findings were tested using a factor analysis as seen in Appendix 1.1 which resulted to the analysis of the significant values that therefore confirm the hypothesis $H_1$: There is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics and leadership effectiveness.
7.4 Demographic Variables and the Impact of Leadership on Job Satisfaction

The analysis of data provided in this section is to test the alternative hypothesis, 

\[ H_{2a}: \text{There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience, and staff positions) and the effects of servant leadership on job satisfaction).} \]

Gender, age, work experience and staff positions constitute the dependent variables, servant leadership represents the independent variable and job satisfaction signifies the possible outcome. Also, the reason for choosing these variables was to provide a more comprehensive data on the evaluation of this hypothesis and ascertain the degree of similarity of dissimilarity of the findings, based upon these variables.
Table 7.4.1: Perceptions of Gender on the effect of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (S)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have developed a close working relationship with my manager</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel left out of the team</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager acknowledges the team for a job well done and not</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>himself/herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of the motivation I received from my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get easily demotivated if I am confused of what tasks I am to</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undertake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not achieve optimum productivity if my manager is not</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested in my output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great chance to work, learn and grow under my manager</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager makes me more innovative at my job</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have work-life balance at my current job</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am satisfied with my work, it would positively influence my output</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation
7.4.1 Perceptions of gender on the effect of servant leadership on job satisfaction

Table 7.4.1 above indicates that the statement “I have developed a close working relationship with my manager” generated a statistical mean of 3.42 and a standard deviation of 0.952. It was also revealed that nearly one-third of male respondents (35%) and a low number of female respondents (18%) agreed to have developed close working relationships with their managers. Alternatively, a substantial number of male (24%) and female (11%) respondents gave neutral opinions on the nature of relationship they had established with their leaders. Surprisingly, a very insignificant number of respondents (male 8% and female 7%) disagreed to having close working relationships with their managers. The contrast in these findings show that many of the respondents were uncertain as to whether they had developed a close working relationship with their leaders. It also shows that only an insubstantial number of females (18%) claimed to have developed close working relationships with their leaders in a sector in which the leaders are predominantly male. However, this does not correlate with some of the interview responses which 5 business leaders said to have developed mutual working relationships with their employees. For example, when the Principal Consultant of a consulting company was asked to describe his level of relationship with his employees, Lead 6 asserted:

I have created a work atmosphere where my employees feel at home and are highly motivated. I could only achieve this by developing a good work relationship with them, with very little boundaries.

The same question was asked to the Head of Sales of a Technology company, Lead 10 who confidently commented:

I am very close to my team members and this is what I believe promotes team spirit within the company. My team members have the morale to deliver and they stand for each other, just as I stand for them.
However, when the Head of Human Resources Department of a hotel (Lead 13) that had won four hospitality awards between 2010-2016, for professionalism and innovation in the hospitality industry was asked the same question, he took some time to think and reluctantly stated:

*I guess I would say that my leadership mantra has always been about “carry everyone along” and I ensure that this is done, not only by me but by all the heads of units in this company. Also, I ensure that regardless of gender, each employee has the fair opportunity to grow their careers in this company.*

In responding to the question of whether he felt his leadership affected his employees’ morale and motivation in the company, and if yes, how? the CEO and Chairman of a notable HR outsourcing company (Lead 17) smiled and stated:

*As a proactive company that we are, I lead in a way that my staff are happy to work and with their job roles. I consider this important, because if they are not happy at work, their productivity will drop. I have general meetings with the entire staff thrice every year to discuss openly how we are faring as a company and what we can do to improve.*

Another response to the same question asked to Lead 17, led to the female Managing Director of a Technology company (Lead 19) making this interesting statement:

*I pursue fairness and equity in the way I lead my employees, which I believe is a boost to their morale and motivation, as you asked. I intentionally make sure that we have an equal number of male and female managers who are competent and smart. I endeavour to see that employees do not feel left out because of their gender or do not sense they have the opportunity to be leaders in this company.*

The statement “I feel left out of my team” generated a statistical mean of 2.57 and a standard deviation of 1.198. A low percentage of male (30%) and female (23%) disagreed to the statement, “I feel left out of the team”. Similarly, a low number of male respondents (16%) and an insignificant number of female respondents (10%) agreed. These findings show a positive correlation of both sexes who agreed and were undecided as to feeling left out of the team. However, it is obvious that a higher number of female respondents disagreed to feeling left out of the team even though the leadership is male dominated. From Table 7.4.1, it is clearly seen that over 80% of the
respondents said they got easily demotivated whenever they were unsure of their tasks. This implies that there were no significant differences between gender perceptions as both male and female respondents strongly agree that uncertainty of task function would drive them into a state of demotivation at work. These results corroborate with statements from Lead 4 and 7.

When Lead 4 was asked what whether his opinion of whether he felt employees were left out of the company, he happily replied:

*In my experience as a leader of this company, I have come to learn that when employees are not clear of their job role and how it relates to the goals of the company, they lose their motivation. I ensure that my company has refresher programmes quarterly in a year, so that we are all on the same page. In this way, they are carried along.*

Another interviewee, Lead 7 replied to the same question by stating:

*I make sure that my employees are aware of where the company is going and do not feel left out. I encourage my supervisors to do the same by informing them of where we are, where we are headed and how they can contribute so we all get there. I would say my company is an open company.*

A low minority of male (26%) and female (11%) respondents claimed that their team received acknowledgements from their managers for effectively accomplishing a task, rather than the manager claiming all the recognition. In contrast, 15% of male and 10% of female respondents said their managers did not display a habit of recognising the team for the successful completion of a task. Whereas, over one-fourth of the male (22%) and one-seventh of the female (14%) respondents were undecided as to whether their teams received acknowledgement from their leaders. This implies that both male and female respondents were of the notion that there was a major gap in team recognition from the managers. This extends further to reveal that managers appeared to receive most of the recognition for the effective achievement of a task, and not the
team. Interestingly and in comparison, most of the interviewees’ responses suggest that they drive team recognition, except Lead 3 who stated:

*Whenever we successfully accomplish a notable task, I make sure the entire team is rewarded fairly. This is a way of the company saying, thank you for your hard work.*

It was interesting to observe the passion with which Lead 7 stated

*My company has an ongoing reward scheme which helps to drive high performance within the company. This is dependent however on what we can achieve within agreed timelines and the quality of work.*

Moreover, the General Manger of Operations of a rapidly expanding telecommunications company Lead 12 stated:

*I work with HR a lot to see that promotions are given to well deserving employees, whether the employee is a male or female. I see it as important that in my company, recognition of employees do not come only through words alone.*

In response to the statement, “*I have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation I received from my manager*”, 25% of male and 14% of female respondents agreed, while 26% of male and 12% of female disagreed. In addition, 22% of male and 14% of female respondents remained undecided. Similarly, 37% of male and 22% of females agreed that they had a *great chance to work, learn and grow under their manager*. However, only 10% of male and 4% of females disagreed. This implies that there is a lack of skill development and employees’ competences were not optimally improved upon. The consequence of this, suggests that employees do not feel their leaders provide the opportunity for them to learn and grow on their job activities. This finding disagrees with the results from 30% of the interviews.

For example, Lead 5 pointed out that,
My company has a skill gap programme handled by the HR department. What they do is to identify skills that employees do not have and provide adequate training for them within our company.

There was an energetic response from **Lead 12** when stating:

*There is no amount of money that is enough for developing staff that I can consider too much. I believe that when you train staff, they become better at their jobs and give back to the company what they have learnt. Staff development is key to my company’s growth and there are some strategies we would not be able to implement except if employees do not develop certain skills.*

**Lead 15** showed so much interest in the question of describing the ways he as a leader was involved in developing employee skillsets and competencies. After getting up from his chair and pointing to a whiteboard and marker in his office, he replied:

*I spend a lot of time working with my employees to identify areas where they lack required skills that would make them more effective in their job role. I start with my managers and supervisors. This is why I have this whiteboard in my office. I want my company to remain a learning company and one that focuses on developing the abilities of employees while they are on the job. My senior managers have whiteboards in their offices too, so they can help their team members too, in addition to the company wide trainings we provide for them.*

Another interviewee **Lead 10** replied to the same question by saying:

*As a technology company with a lot of competition, I make sure that my employees are well trained to be fit for the competition within our business space.*

There was a short but concise response from the CEO of a telecommunications company, **Lead 18** to the same question when he stated:

*I always make efforts to see that my employees develop their skills and abilities through the support of the company.*

The Managing Director of a consulting company **Lead 20** gave this response to the same question by stating:
At the beginning of every year, the HR unit sends me a training program for the company for the entire year. I review it with them and are clear of what the outcomes of these trainings would be. I know the importance of staff training and development and it has become an integral part of my company.

The respondents were asked to indicate their perception to this statement, “My manager makes me more innovative at my job.” A slightly significant number of male (27%) and female (15%) respondents agreed. Similarly, a marginal number of male (19%) and female (14%) respondents disagreed. This clearly implies that the majority of the respondents hold the premise that their leaders have not effectively contributed to their innovative growth. Despite this, when asked on how they felt their leadership style influenced employees’ job satisfaction, Lead 16 commented:

In this company, we have spent money on training and after a while, we noticed that after the training, some employees’ leave for competitors or other companies where the skills they got would help them. I don’t have a problem in staff leaving when they want to. It is inevitable, but I think it is a loss to the company if we have invested so much and get little. I spoke to HR and they developed in our training policy a contract agreement for certain training programmes in which the employee who has been trained cannot leave until after a certain period. I think employees also, have an individual responsibility to develop themselves by themselves and not always wait for the company.

In responding to this same question, Lead 9 asserted:

One thing I do for sure is to make sure that any employee that gets into this company leaves better than he or she came in. Being a consulting firm, we spend a lot of time and money in creating new ideas to meet the needs of our clients. For us to meet those needs, my staff need to be as creative as possible to keep up with current trends of our market industry. We provide the best trainings to make them effective and I am sure that gives them a good amount of job satisfaction.

However, regardless of the commitment of business leaders towards training and staff development, a significant number of employees still do not support the notion that their leaders have improved their level of creativity and innovation in practise. Moreover, the results of this study as shown in Table 7.4.1 indicate that about one-third of male respondents (32%) and one-quarter of female respondents (25%) agreed to have work-
life balance because of their current leader. Also, it is apparent from Table 7.4.1 that there was no increase of responses in support of having the chance to work, learn and grow in their organisations. This is because only 16% of male and 12% of females agreed. However, further analysis of the results show that nearly half of the male respondents (47%) agreed to have developed new skillsets because of their managers. Surprisingly, a higher number of female respondents (64%) agreed to this statement. On the contrary, only 29% of male and 29% of females agreed to their manager making them more innovative on their job. Similarly, when the issue of team cohesion based on managers’ influence was asked, nearly half of the male respondents (48%) and nearly two-thirds of the female respondents (64%) agreed to feeling left out of their teams. Even though, a very significant majority of 92% of the respondents agree that job satisfaction has a positive effect on their work output, the results however suggest that certain elements as employee motivation, innovation, employee development, team cohesiveness, motivation and morale and work-life balance that contribute to job satisfaction have not been substantially met by the business leaders within the organisations where they work. Consequently, it provides evidence of an overwhelming need for job satisfaction as respondents believe that job satisfaction is a key determinant of their work output.
Table 7.4.2: Perceptions Using Respondents’ Age on the effect of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have developed a close working relationship with my manager</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel left out of the team</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager acknowledges the team for a job well done and not himself/herself</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation I received from my manager</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get easily demotivated if I am confused of what tasks I am to undertake</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not achieve optimum productivity if my manager is not interested in my output</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great chance to work, learn and grow under my manager</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager makes me more innovative at my job</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4.2 provides the results obtained from the analysis of the data based upon respondents’ perceptions of leadership on job satisfaction according to the different age groups. What stands out in the table is that the highest number (70) of respondents who agreed to have developed close working relationships with managers were within the 26-35 years age bracket. Respondents aged between 55-65 years were the least number of respondents who agreed to have developed close working relationships with their managers. This finding strongly corresponds with the replies from respondents aged within the 36-45 years age group.

In addition, analysis of data related to the relationship between team inclusion and job satisfaction led to different responses. While, a small minority of respondents (10%) aged 18-25 years indicated that they felt left out of the team in their companies, a high majority of 71% within the same age group held an opposite view. Table 7.4.2 shows that out of 132 respondents within the 26-35 age bracket, 40 of the respondents (30%) agreed to feeling left out of the team. Correspondingly, a low number of 23 respondents (31%) aged 36-45 years reported that they felt left out of their current teams. In comparison, nearly two-thirds (63%) of the respondents within the 45-55 age range said they felt left out of the team. In addition, 40% of the total number of respondents whose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have work-life balance at my current job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Researcher’s Compilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4.2 provides the results obtained from the analysis of the data based upon respondents’ perceptions of leadership on job satisfaction according to the different age groups. What stands out in the table is that the highest number (70) of respondents who agreed to have developed close working relationships with managers were within the 26-35 years age bracket. Respondents aged between 55-65 years were the least number of respondents who agreed to have developed close working relationships with their managers. This finding strongly corresponds with the replies from respondents aged within the 36-45 years age group.

In addition, analysis of data related to the relationship between team inclusion and job satisfaction led to different responses. While, a small minority of respondents (10%) aged 18-25 years indicated that they felt left out of the team in their companies, a high majority of 71% within the same age group held an opposite view. Table 7.4.2 shows that out of 132 respondents within the 26-35 age bracket, 40 of the respondents (30%) agreed to feeling left out of the team. Correspondingly, a low number of 23 respondents (31%) aged 36-45 years reported that they felt left out of their current teams. In comparison, nearly two-thirds (63%) of the respondents within the 45-55 age range said they felt left out of the team. In addition, 40% of the total number of respondents whose
age range was between 55-65 felt left out of their existing team. The overall responses, as presented above show that across all the age groups, there are a number of respondents that felt excluded from the team. The majority of respondents with this perception of exclusion from their current teams are mainly those aged 45-55 and 55-65 respectively. Nonetheless, it is clear that a very insignificant number of respondents aged 18-25 years felt left out of their teams. However, these results are quite revealing in that there is no correlation between some of the above findings and the responses of business leader from the interview. For example, Lead 16 emphatically remarked:

*I do all I can to make sure that every staff has a sense of belonging in this organisation and I ensure that there is team spirit. In fact, every year, HR implements a number of team bonding activities for the entire staff.*

When the Head of Human Resources Department, Lead 13 described the corporate spirit in his company by stating:

*What makes the leadership in my company unique, is that we foster a corporate team spirit which shows itself in how we work, and I believe a lot has to do with the leadership of the entire company.*

Moreover, Table 7.4.2 shows that a low number of respondents (15%) aged between 18-25 years agreed that they received recognition for the jobs they did, while nearly half of the respondents (45%) disagreed. Also, a fair proportion of respondents within the age 26-35 years agreed (30%) and disagreed (33%) to the statement “*I get rewarded by my manager for excellent performance of my job tasks*”. While, 39% and 38% of respondents aged 36-45 and 46-55 years respectively disagreed to their teams receiving recognition from their managers, only a small minority of respondents (20%) aged 55-65 years disagreed. Hence, a very significant number of respondents (60%) whose age range was between 55-65 years agreed that they received recognition from their managers. The results also pinpoint that while the majority of the respondents who receive recognition for their jobs were of the 55-65 years age group, most of the
respondents in the other age groups disagreed. However, 5 of the 20 business leaders who were interviewed supported the statement that they recognise their team members for their jobs. For example, Lead 4 whose workforce mainly constitute of young and middle-aged employees put it this way:

*I spend a lot of time walking with the HR manager to focus on how we can appreciate employees that are showing top performance on their job roles. Being a technology software company with most of our employees being young and fresh graduates, staff motivation is important to me. Because there is strong competition in this industry, it would be terrible for us to lose a very good employee to our competitor because he or she did not feel we valued their work.*

Another statement by Lead 5 when asked if the company had a policy for rewarding staff and how it was operated. After a little hesitation, he replied:

*Yes, there is of course. Every end of the year, the company has an incentive for staff performance. The HR unit reviews the performance appraisals for all the teams and notifies me of the top 5 employees the company. Being a company with 5 departments, we have an employee of the year from each of the teams and a cash reward is given to them. This has for the past 4 years become part of the company policy. Before then, we used to give awards and recognise staff publicly, but I decided to put more structure to it.*

Other interviewees alluded to the notion that they focus on recognising employees in their responses. A case in point, was when Lead 8 asserted: *I place staff recognition as key priority for all staff, especially those who are elderly and have spent a high number of years in my company. I don’t want those younger in the company to feel, there is no reward for being a good employee and for being loyal to the company. For example, we recently gave a car to a very hard-working employee who was due to retire and leave the company.*

Without any expression of indecision, Lead 16 confidently said:

*In my company, we have a “Young Leader’s Award night” where we give rewards to employees between the ages of 20-24 years who have*
demonstrated exceptional team impact. I ensure that the young people are rewarded so they see the need to grow with the company.

Another comment illustrated by Lead 20 was:

*As part of my company’s staff recognition scheme, I ensure that we give financial support to employees who are aged above 55 years and have worked in the company for more than 15 years. It is a way of showing appreciation even before they retire.*

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation they received from their managers. What is interesting as shown in Table 7.4.2 is that the lowest number of respondents (23%) who agreed were in the 18-25 years age group. However, the table also reveals a clear trend of an increasing number of respondents who agreed to be within the age groups: 36-45 years, 46-55 years and 55-65 years. The reason for this is because 50% of the respondents within 36-45 years agreed, while a very significant 75% aged between 46-55 years also agreed. Furthermore, a high majority of respondents (60%) aged 55-65 years indicated their agreement to acquiring new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation they received from their managers. Of the 20 business leaders who were interviewed, only 4 of them gave responses confirming that they motivate their employees to acquire new skillsets.

For instance, Lead 2 said:

*Regardless of how old any employee is, I make sure the company encourages training programs that help them develop required skills for effective delivery of their daily tasks.*

Another interviewee who was the CEO of an Estate and Property company Lead 9 enthusiastically stated:

*As a leader, I have learned that employees easily lose their sense of engagement to the company if they do not develop new abilities on their jobs. This is why, I ensure my HR unit does a skills assessment audit to*
identify skill gaps and provide the necessary training internally or externally.

In describing how his leadership of the Human Resources Department handled the development of employees’ skillsets and competencies, **Lead 13** asserted:

*I do not allow employees work in roles that they are not well equipped for, especially as my company is one that has a progressive career chart which allows competent young people become leaders early. Therefore, I make sure we help them obtain the required skills because as the roles become different, so the skills required.*

Another interviewee who had alluded to the fact that the nature of business activity was technology and service driven, **Lead 18** stated:

*I try to encourage my staff to learn new ideas to help our company grow and this can only happen if they develop themselves too. This is why every employee from the customer service representative to senior executives go through a training program.*

In response to the statement, “I get easily demotivated if I am confused of what tasks I am to undertake”, an overwhelming majority of respondents across the age groups responded in the affirmative. For respondents aged 18-25, 74% of them said they felt easily demotivated if there was no task clarity. In the same way, for the age groups, 26-35, 36-45 and 45-55 years respectively, 80%, 86% and 75% of the total number of respondents respectively agreed. Surprisingly, 100% of the respondents from the 55-65 age bracket also agreed. This goes to show that a very significant majority of respondents across all the age groups agreed to the significance of task clarity and saw it as a factor that could either motivate or demotivate them. It does not confirm the findings from the interviewees. For example, **Lead 16** stated:

*My company always ensures that new employees are clear of what their job activities entail. In addition, we also have refresher programmes for old employees to keep them up to date with their tasks, so they can keep being motivated on their jobs. I have told my supervisors that I would not accept any employee not knowing what their daily or monthly tasks are. I think it would not be fair to blame an employee for not knowing what he or she was meant to have been trained on.*
When asked whether she felt employees were sure of the tasks they were meant to undertake, **Lead 19** said:

*No matter how long an employee has spent in my company, I have general meetings with employees to know if they are clear about their job roles and if they know how their tasks are linked to our company’s objective. I don’t lead by explaining the big-picture to my employees without them being clear of their tasks in the first place.*

Another interviewee **Lead 6** replied:

*Since I started leading this company, I regularly move around the entire company to discuss with employees at all levels how they are faring on their jobs and if there was anyway the company could help them become more effective.*

Moreover, it can be seen from Table 7.4.2 that when the respondents were questioned on whether they had work-life balance in their current job roles, nearly two-thirds of the respondents (65%) aged 18-25 agreed to having work-life balance. Similarly, over half of the respondents (52%) within the ages of 26-35 agreed to this. Likewise, a significant number of respondents (58%) from ages 36-45 stated that they had work-life balance in their current jobs. Furthermore, of the respondents aged between 45-55 and 55-65 years respectively, only 62% and 40% respectively said that they had work-life balance in their current companies. It is evidently clear that more than average of the respondents across all age groups said that they had work-life balance except respondents aged 55-65.

Therefore, it can be concluded that in relation to age, there was a disparity of agreement across the age groups on the state of relationships with their managers. Similarly, the different age groups do not all agree to have a sense of belonging in their teams, on recognition, personal development and growth and work-life balance. However, these findings do not confirm the responses generated from the business leaders who were interviewed.
Table 7.4.3: Perceptions Using the Work Experience of Respondents on the effect of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have developed a close working relationship with my manager</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel left out of the team</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager acknowledges the team for a job well done and not himself/herself</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation I received from my manager</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get easily demotivated if I am confused of what tasks I am to undertake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not achieve optimum productivity if my manager is not interested in my output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great chance to work, learn and grow under my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager makes me more innovative at my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

251
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have work-life balance at my current job</th>
<th>1-11 months</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-7 years</th>
<th>8 years and above</th>
<th>1-11 months</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-7 years</th>
<th>8 years and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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What stands out in Table 7.4.3 is that the highest number of respondents who agreed to have developed close working relationships with their managers were 54% of the respondents who had worked for 8 years and above in their organisations. It is also notable that over half of the respondents (51%) with work experiences of 4-7 years also agreed to have developed close working relationships with their managers. In comparison, the lowest number of respondents (44%) who agreed had working experiences of 1-3 years. However, all the respondents within work experiences of between 1-11 months were undecided in their answer to the statement posed.

Furthermore, Table 7.4.3 shows that nearly half of the respondents (40%) with 8 years’ work experience and above admitted to feeling left out of the team. However, this does not correspond with 79% of respondents with work experiences of 1-3 years disagreed to feeling left out of the team. Also, of the 285 respondents who responded to the questionnaire, 29% with 4-7 years’ work experience agreed that their managers acknowledged the team for a job well done and not himself/herself. Also, 47% of the respondents with 1-3 years’ work experience stated that their managers failed to acknowledge the team for a job well done and not himself/herself.

As can be seen from Table 7.3.4, the significant number of respondents who agreed to have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation they received from their manager were 72% that had work experience of 8 years and above. In contrast, the highest number of respondents who disagreed were 55% with 1-3 years of work experience. Also, the majority (62%) of those who responded to the statement “I have a great chance to work, learn and grow under my manager” had 4-7 years of work experience. However, 23% of respondents with 1-3 years of work experience disagreed to the statement above. Moreover, of the 285 respondents who completed the questionnaire, approximately two-thirds (67%) of the respondents with 1-
11 months of work experience stated that their managers made them more innovative at their job roles. The highest number of respondents (46%) who disagreed had work experience of 8 years and above.

The above findings do not confirm with those obtained from the 20 business leaders. The broad themes that emerged from the analysis of the qualitative data highlighted a variety of views which do not support the responses to the questionnaire.

For example, **Lead 3** took this stance in describing his relationship with employees within his organisation by stating:

> Since I started this company 9 years ago, I make sure I am close to my employees. In fact, those who have worked with me since the inception of this company are already like family members. Even though I ensure that I don’t mix business with pleasure, this close relationship I believe helps to build trust, commitment and keeps them satisfied on their jobs.

Talking about the issue of feeling left out of the team, **Lead 7** stated,

> I make sure that no body in my team feels left out. If you ask, employees that have worked with this company for the past 3 years, they would tell you that I have championed building a family and high team spirit in this company

In attempting to describe his leadership philosophy, the General Manager of a leading Estate and Property company, **Lead 8** said:

> My leadership motto has always been, “focus on the employees and they will focus on the company”. As a leader of a company within a demanding sector, it is my personal policy to appreciate team members for their efforts openly. Employees who have worked here since the past 5 years would tell you that we have a high reward company policy, which I believe makes employees satisfied as they go on their daily activities.

After much persuasion to describe if the company had a career growth policy for employees and how important it was to his leadership, **Lead 4** stated:
I encourage employees to develop new skills and knowledge that would make them effective on their jobs, to the organisation and even their personal aspirations. In my company, you will notice that employees are fast at developing new skills every year and this makes them prepared for future managerial positions within this company. The current Head of Sales and Business Strategy in my company started off as a graduate intern 10 years ago.

In describing how imperative it was for her employees to develop to grow on their jobs, the female Managing Director of a consulting company, Lead 20 remarked:

*Because of the nature of business we do, innovation has to drive our company. I lead a team of vibrant professional who I ensure the company provides with adequate opportunities to make them more innovative. I get a lot of pressure from Board of Directors and it would be unfair of me to give same pressure to team members if they have not been well equipped by the company. Employees who work for just 1 or 2 years in this company would confirm that they have developed as innovative employees due to the opportunities provided for their growth.*

Even though a recurrent theme in the interviews suggest a positive relationship to these items measured on the questionnaire that measure the extent of leadership to job satisfaction, it is noticeable that they generally do not confirm the findings from the questionnaire.
Table 7.4.4: Perceptions using the Staff Positions of Respondents on the effect of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have developed a close working relationship with my manager</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel left out of the team</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager acknowledges the team for a job well done and not himself/herself</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation I received from my manager</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get easily demotivated if I am confused of what tasks I am to undertake</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not achieve optimum productivity if my manager is not interested in my output</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a great chance to work, learn and grow under my manager</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager makes me more innovative at my job</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have work-life balance at my current job</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am satisfied with my work, it would positively influence my output</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Researcher’s Compilation*
Table 7.4.4 above shows that out of the 128 respondents who are in junior positions, 65 of them (52%) agreed to the statement “I have developed a close working relationship with my manager”. However, 44% of the respondents were neutral as 18% of them disagreed to the statement above. Furthermore, 55% of the mid-level employees felt they had close work relationships with their managers, while a small minority of 15% disagreed, leaving out 36% of them who gave neutral responses. Also, nearly half of the respondents (46%) at senior level (but not managerial positions) agreed to the statement that they had close relationship with their managers. Table 7.4.4 also reveals that only 20% of senior employees disagreed to having close relationships with their managers. These results clearly indicate that employees in mid-level positions had developed the most significant level of close relationships with their managers and senior employees developed the least close relationships. On the contrary, senior employees had the highest number of respondents who disagreed to having close work relations with their managers. Overall, the results indicate that almost half of the entire respondents across all staff positions did not have close working relationship with their managers or could not ascertain the level of relationship they had.

Less than one-third of the respondents (27%) who were junior employees said they felt left out of their teams, while 55% of them disagreed to this and felt they were part of the team. This left 19% of the respondents who were undecided. Respondents at the mid-level positions also shared similar responses. While one-fifth of the respondents (20%) commented that they felt left out of the team, a significant number of respondents (56%) disagreed. However, nearly half of the respondents (46%) who were in senior positions agreed to feeling left out of the team and a matching number of other senior staff respondents (40%) disagreed. This clearly reveals that the majority of the respondents identified team inclusion as a major gap that was lacking under their current leadership.
However, this finding does not correspond with 4 of the business leaders interviews. For example, Lead 5 asserted,

\[ I \text{ do not care whether an employee is at a junior or senior level, I try to carry everyone along. } \]

It was Lead 17, who put it this way,

\[ I \text{ am very conscious to seeing that all employees feel that they own this company and that if the company goes down, we all go down. I have an open door policy and I ensure that managers in my company do same. } \]

Another interviewee Lead 18 who described the level of staff awareness in his company by stating:

\[ \text{It is my responsibility to make sure everyone in the company is informed on what the company is doing and where it is. I see every employee as a key part of the company. I was contacted by another executive of a company who told me that he had a chat with an employee of my company who told him a lot about our services. He said, he was shocked to know that the staff in question, was only a driver and couldn’t imagine how he at that level could be so well informed.} \]

One of the few female business leaders interviewed, Lead 20 provided the statement below:

\[ \text{I usually have meetings with heads of units and their staff regardless of position for everyone to express themselves. This helps me as a leader to know the gaps in which my staff need direction, information or at times, have too much information.} \]

With reference to their current leadership, when the statement “I have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation I received from my manager” was posed, Table 7.4.4 above shows that while 45% of junior employees agreed to have acquired new skillsets because of their managers, 40% of them did not feel the same. Also, responses from employees in mid-level positions indicate that while over one-thirds of the respondents (37%) claimed to have developed new competencies due to managerial influence, nearly half of them (45%) felt this was not the case. Also, the number of senior employees gave their responses show that 29% of them agree to
have learned new skillsets under their managers. However, this does not correlate with a significant number of employees in senior positions (57%) whose responses confirm that they have not developed new skillsets and competencies from their manager’s influence. It is clearly evident that employees in senior positions are the most affected in terms of skill development. The overall responses seemingly indicate that across all the staff positions, most of the staff have not acquired new skillsets and competencies under their current leadership. These findings do not correspond with the views of the leaders interviewed who were asked to describe if they considered the development of skillsets by employees as integral to their leadership. For example, Lead 6 stated:

*I have made it a sense of duty to making sure that employees at all levels in the company benefit from opportunities where they can develop new skills.*

Another interviewee, Lead 7 replied by stating:

*I work with HR to ensure that junior staff can develop through the company’s fund programme. Through this programme some junior staff have completed part-time university degrees and acquired very vital skills that has helped them in our company.*

Furthermore, Lead 15 said:

*I spend a lot of my time seeing that my employees gain new skills that will help them function more effectively. I walk the floors and find out from my employees, from the bottom to top employees on what they lack and how the company can assist.*

The findings above have revealed that the importance of team inclusion, close working relationships between leader and followers, development of skills and competencies, and the leader’s ability to enhance employee innovation as key factors that influence job satisfaction. Based upon the analysis above, it can be concluded that the second hypothesis (H2a) which states that:
There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience, and staff positions) and the effect of servant leadership on job satisfaction is accepted.

7.5. Demographic Variables and the Application of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

This section investigates the effects that the application of servant leadership had on organisational citizenship behaviour by estimating the responses according to four (4) primary variables: gender, age, work experience, and staff positions. This led to testing the alternative hypothesis, H2b that: There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience, and staff positions) and the effect of servant leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour.
### Table 7.5.1: Perceptions using the Gender of Respondents and the effect of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (S)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many times my manager puts my interest before his/her own</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not mind spending extra hours coming on a weekend to ensure a task is completed because of my manager</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I do not trust my manager, I cannot work effectively with him/her</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of leadership I receive is important to my work performance</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The actions of my manager influence the way I do my job</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation
Table 7.5.1 detailed the self-sacrificial element of business leaders as perceptions of the respondents were provided to the statement “There are many times my manager puts my interest before his/her own”. Males and females indicated whether they saw their managers as people who will put their own personal interests before those of themselves (that is, the leaders). Table 7.5.1 reveals through a calculated statistical mean of 3.08, and a standard deviation of 1.425 that nearly half (48%) of the male and 44% of the female respondents reported that the primary focus of their managers is on their personal interest, and not those of the managers. Furthermore, over one-third of the male respondents (39%) and 44% of the female respondents stated their managers primary interest was on themselves and not on the team. This suggests that a significant majority of both male and female respondents do not agree that their managers consistently consider their interests as priority through their leadership style. However, this does not correspond with 4 of the 20 business leaders interviewed. For example, the female Managing Director a technology company Lead 19 passionately stated:

As a female Managing Director in a male dominated industry, I am open about my priority to support females in this company. As someone who is a financier of projects seeking to develop the girl child in Northern Nigeria. For this reason, I am very clear of my consideration of females within this company. HR knows that if I have to make a decision between hiring a male or female employee; I'll consider the female employee is she is sound

The CEO of a prominent ICT company in Abuja Lead 7 said:

I like to make sure there is fairness in my company as I lead my staff and that is why I have the same number of female managers as their male counterparts. To me, the interest of my staff comes first.

It was interesting to note the remark of the Head of Human Resources Department of a top rated company in the hospitality industry, Lead 13 who asserted:
I like to lead by putting the interest of my team first especially if it will help them work better. For example, when I realised that a number of mothers were finding it difficult to cope with their children, as the Head of HR, after convincing the General Manager, I made sure the company gave contributed 70% to the cost of a high quality crèche near the office. This helps female employees focus and become more effective.

Another interviewee, who is the Managing Director of Student Recruitment in the education sector Lead 15 described the self-sacrificial element of his leadership style when he replied:

I lead with my people first in my mind. There are times when I have stayed late in the office to complete a task because my employee had to be with his wife in the hospital and we had a deadline to submit a project to our client.

When the respondents were asked if they did not mind spending extra hours (unpaid) coming to work on a weekend to ensure a task is completed because of their manager, more than half of the males (54%) and a significant number of females (63%) felt they would be willing to work extra hours on a weekend. Even though 12% of males and 7% of females disagreed to coming to work for additional hours on weekend, it is observable that 34% of the males and 30% of the females did not clarify their opinion to this question and were undecided. Surprisingly, it can be deducted that more male respondents were unwilling to spend additional hours at work on a weekend than females as this statement “I do not mind spending extra hours coming on a weekend to ensure a task is completed because of my manager” generated a calculated statistical mean of 3.61> and a standard deviation of 0.957. However, these results are different from the findings derived from the qualitative data in some respects. For example, the Head of Academic Affairs in the education sector, Lead 11 stated:

I appreciate my employees a lot, especially the females within this who tend to sometimes work on Saturdays to meet up key tasks.
The female CEO of a rapidly growing training company Lead 13 when asked if she felt employees were willing to spend extra hours in the office if they had to? She replied:

*I tend to have more problems getting the males in my company to spend extra hours if there is an urgent need to. I have noticed that females in this company tend to sacrifice their time more to help the company.*

Another interviewee, who is the CEO of an outstanding HR outsourcing company, Lead 17 when asked the same question replied:

*I would say, both male and female employees are committed to their jobs and are willing to spend extra hours if they need to. However, I have to say, it is easier for the men because most of my female employees may have to rush home after work to cater for their children. That being said, I have very hardworking employees and even though we have a very young workforce, I am impressed to see both males and females make extra effort to accomplish certain tasks. This is why we have loyal customers, because my staff always have their hands on the deck. There was a day, I saw a male employee working till 10pm when he had to still be at work the next day. That is the kind of dedication I reward.*

The element of leader trust as an essential dimension of organisational citizenship behaviour was explored through the statement “If I do not trust my manager, I cannot work effectively with him/her”. Table 7.5.1 shows a mean of 3.35>, and a standard deviation of 1.183 as over half of those surveyed indicated that trust for their managers influenced their willingness to effectively work with them. This implies that more than half of the male (56%) and female (54%) respondents agreed to this. On the contrary, there was a small minority of male (24%) and female (29%) respondents who claimed that trust from their managers would not inform their ability to effectively work with them. These results prove that many male and female respondents identify trust for their leader as a significant factor in the relationships with their leaders. It is noteworthy that of all the 20 business leaders interviewed, only 4 of them, used the term “trust” to
describe the working relationship with their employees. For example, in explaining how
relationships have become a building block to his leadership style, Lead 1 stated:

I have built a great relationship with my employees. For example, I was
privileged to be made the chairman at the wedding reception ceremony
of a female employee who got married. Even though I was not part of
her nuclear family, it was such an honour and I believe it is based on
trust my employees have for me.

Also, the female CEO of a Training and Staff Development company Lead 3 said:

I trust my team members and I do all I can to make them trust me too.
This helps us in achieving the company’s objectives together. Yet, I
think most of the females in my company tend to trust me more than the
males. I cannot say whether it is because I am a female myself, and if
that gives them some inspiration. I really can’t say but I see more
commitment from women than men.

Similarly, in describing his working relationship with his employees, the Head of Sales of
a technology software company whose client base cut across Nigeria, Lead 10 replied:

It is very important to me that my staff trust me. I believe that I have failed in my
leadership, if they do not trust me enough to know that I can lead them effectively, then
we all cannot move forward. In my team, I see more willingness from female staff to
comply with our plans than the males. It’s as if the male staff always have a point to
prove, even when it may not be necessary.

After an engaging conversation with Lead 20, the female Managing Director of a
technology company highlighted on the element of trust when she stated:

I always want to be held accountable even by my employees, no matter
the position in the company. This has helped me over the years earn
their trust and develop a rapport with them.

This section has evaluated responses that look at the relationship between the
characteristics of servant leadership in relation to organisational citizenship behaviour
(OCB). It suggests that females tend to demonstrate more of the mediating variables of organisational citizenship behaviours such as display of helping behaviours, organisational loyalty and organisational compliance than males. The next section would be investigating the results derived according to the five different age groups and significant findings would be presented.

7.5.2 Age, Servant Leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Table 7.5.2 shows that a significant number of respondents (63%) aged between 46-55 years agreed that they were many times their managers put their interests (that is, the employees) before their own interests (managers). Also, just above half of the respondents (52%) within the 26-36 years group agreed. Conversely, nearly two-thirds (60%) of those aged between 55-65 years disagreed. Furthermore, these findings do not significantly confirm those of the interviews of which 3 out of the 20 business leaders agreed to focusing on their employees' interests before their personal ones. For instance, the Managing Director of an ICT company Lead 14 was asked how much of his employees' personal goals he was aware of. He said:

*I do not mind going out of my way to know to make sure that my employees have their interests met. In this company, I have a lot of young and very smart employees who just left university. I ensure that they see my company as one that is interested in their daily job roles and also their future in the company.*

Another interviewee, Lead 18, responded to the same question when he replied:

*As much as I can, I like to make sure that I find out from my team members what their personal goals are. In my experience, as a leader of this company for 14 years, I have learnt that it has helped me become more successful in leading my team. For those who are older in my company, I find out what their retirement plans are to see if the company can assist in any way.*
Surprisingly, the female Managing Director of Technology Company, Lead 20 almost gave an emotional yet cheerful response when she stated:

*That question brought to my mind where I am coming from. Many years ago, I used to be an intern in a very big bank in Nigeria. I was still in the 2nd year in university and I really wanted to develop a career, so I appealed to someone to help me get into the bank as an intern to work with the technical team. While working there, I was ready to carry out every activity, including working on behalf of the CEOs receptionist when she was off duty. One day, the CEO asked me what I was doing and I told him. He spoke to the Head of HR at the time for the company to pay my remaining 3 years tuition fees. After that, I got a job at the end of my 5 years university degree in the bank. I am sharing this personal story, because I am where I am today because a leader was concerned about my personal goals. For me, I spend a lot of time speaking to my staff, especially my younger employees and ensuring that the company meets their interests fairly and within our capacity.*

Table 7.5.2 also revealed that a high number of respondents (63%) aged 26-35 years agreed that they do not mind spending extra hours coming on a weekend to ensure that a task is completed because of their managers. Similarly, a significant number of respondents (60%) aged 55-65 also agreed. On the contrary, 62% of those aged between 46-55 years disagreed. Also, a very significant number of respondents aged 26 years and above agreed that they cannot work effectively with their managers if they did not trust them. For example, 59% of respondents aged 26-35 agreed. Similarly, another 55% of respondents aged 36-45 years agreed to the statement “I do not mind spending extra hours coming on a weekend to ensure a task is completed because of my manager”. On the other hand, it can also be seen that approximately two-thirds of respondents aged 55 years and above disagreed. Also, it is obvious that a very significant number of respondents across all the age groups agreed that the kind of leadership they received was important to their work performance. These findings confirm those of the interviews of which 4 out of the 20 business leaders interviewed recurrently used the term “productivity” to explain the impact of their leadership style.

For example, the Principal Consultant of a HR outsourcing firm, Lead 1 stated:
I like to lead every employee in such a way that they become more productive.

In relating to how she sees herself as a leader, the female CEO of a Training company, Lead 3 remarked:

*I see myself as leader who mentors young employees. This I believe increases their work productivity and makes them grow in this company.*

The Managing Director a company involved in large scale manufacture of furniture and the provision of carpentry services nationwide, Lead 16 alluded to his focus on the seniors in his company by stating:

*To improve the productivity of my staff that are nearly retiring, I have developed a platform called “The Elders Forum” in which they can help the company train and develop younger employees in the company. For the past 3 years I have myself coordinated this programme in the company and for this role, they receive a bonus to their salaries.*

In another response, the CEO of a telecommunications company, Lead 18 said:

*I like to empower my employees in such a way that they see themselves as co-owners of the company regardless of how young or old they are. This gives them a sense of ownership and responsibility and I believe it keeps improving their productivity.*

Therefore it can be concluded across all age groups identify their leaders as individuals whose primary interest is to focus on their own interests (that is, the respondents). It also reveals that there are many respondents who would be willing to commit themselves towards achieving organisational tasks even if it conflicted with their free schedule. The next section would examine these findings in relation to responses based upon employees’ work experience.
Table 7.5.2: Perceptions Using the Age of Respondents and the effect of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Age 18-25</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are many times my manager puts my interest before his/her own</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not mind spending extra hours coming on a weekend to ensure a task is completed because of my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I do not trust my manager, I cannot work effectively with him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of leadership I receive is important to my work performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The actions of my manager influences the way I do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.5.3 Work Experiences, Servant Leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Table 7.5.3 below summarises the data derived from respondents according to their work experience in their companies. The findings reveal that less than half of the respondents (41%) with a work experience of 1-3 years agree to the notion that there were many times when their managers placed their interest as primary. Similarly, only 48% of the respondents with 4-7 years of work experience reported that many times their interests were their manager’s prime focus. Just a little above half (51%) of the total respondents with a work experience of 8 years and above said they felt they were many times when their managers had put their interests first. These findings suggest that there is a significant number of respondents who, on the contrary, indicate that there were many times when self-focus was the primary interest of their managers. An uncommon view amongst the interviewees was in relation to their leadership having the interest of their employees as their primary interest. For example, The General Manager of an ICT company, Lead 5 stated:

*A main interest as I lead my employees is in paying attention to what they are interested in. I spend time to see how their interests line up with the company objectives and even if they don’t, I try my best to support because I know it would in turn make the employees more motivated and focused. For example, 2 months ago, I sponsored an employee who had worked with my company for 12 years for a cooking masterclass which she told me was of interest to her when she retired from the company.*

The female CEO of a Training and Staff Development company, Lead 3 emphasised on how her primary interest was on focusing on employees, when she asserted:

*There was a time I made sure the HR unit gave an employee who had been with us for 2 years an extra month holiday to participate in a national musical competition called “The Voice”. Well, the reason I allowed this was because first of all, this employee was a very hardworking and diligent employee who was one of the best in his department. I did not want him to*
resign which he wanted. Although, we did not pay him during the period, we were willing to help him pursue his dream.

Another interviewee, the CEO of a telecommunications company, Lead 18 said:

In my company, I recently started giving end of year bonuses to only employees who had worked for 5 years and above. This bonus plan I believe would support them financially to achieve certain personal goals. I want to believe that my action is a bold statement from my company that there is always a reward for loyalty, and that the company appreciates it.

In response to the statement “I do not mind spending extra hours coming on a weekend to ensure a task is completed because of my manager”, out of the 44 respondents with a work experience of 1-3 years, 20 of the respondents agreed (45%), while 38% of them remained undecided. However, this was not the case with those respondents with 4-7 years of work experience as nearly two-thirds of the respondents (61%) claimed they would be willing to put in additional hours. Over half of the respondents (51%) with 8 years and above work experience indicated their willingness to provide extra hours towards the completion of a task because of their managers. These results imply that the majority of those who would be willing to put in extra hours to complete a task because of their manager fall under the category of respondents with 4-7 years of work experience. In addition, 15% of the business leaders interviewed gave the following responses.

According to the General Manager of an Estate and Property company, Lead 8 remarked:

I encourage all my staff to give their best to the company. I am often surprised when I see staff especially those young employees who have been with us for under 5 years work late hours just to see that key tasks are met.

Following this statement, the CEO of the same company mentioned above gave a similar response when he stated:
I lead my team in such a way they are inspired to love their jobs and the company. I reward and recognise hard work and good character and it most of time pays back when I see employees go the extra mile to help the company. I came by the office on a weekend and saw an employee who has been with us for 9 months working on a project that was due in 2 weeks. I was inspired by his sincere commitment to the company even when he had a lot of time to get the project completed.

There was a bold expression in the remark by the female Managing Director of a technology company Lead 20 when she said:

*It is my responsibility to always encourage my employees to work hard. There is a cleaner whose hard work is admirable. She always comes on Saturday mornings to clean the company when she could do the same early on Mondays. She has been doing this for 9 years and is highly rewarded and respected in the company.*

Out of the 44 respondents with 1-3 years of work experience that were asked if the actions of their managers influence the way they carried out their job functions, 55% of them agreed. In the same way, 60% of the respondents with a work experience of 4-7 years stated that their managers’ actions had an impact on their job activities. However, less than one-fifth of the respondents (17%) disagreed while 23% of the respondents chose not to express their opinion. Similarly, approximately two-thirds of the respondents (66%) with a work experience of 8 years and above agreed to the influence of their managers’ activities on the way they undertook their job functions. These findings infer that the respondents with the highest number of years of experience firmly express the notion that their managers’ actions influence their job activities. Of the 20 business leaders interviewed, only 3 gave responses that showed the relationship between their leadership and its influence on how employees carried out their job functions. For example, the Head of Academic Affairs, Lead 11 in a private university stated:
Working closely with employees who are new to the company is a priority to me. I believe it not only see that they settle in quickly in my unit, but also help them become more effective on their tasks.

After giving some thought to the question of whether he would describe his leadership as having an impact on employees’ jobs, the lively CEO and Chairman of a HR outsourcing company, Lead 18 provided this lengthy remark:

My endeavour is that I demonstrate the kind of behaviour that shows my integrity and sincere willingness towards the progress of my employees. I want them to keep being better on their job activities and I reward creativity that benefits the company. Being a technology company in a competitive business environment, I encourage my employees to be creative. There was an intern in my company for 4 months who had graduated and within those 4 months, he had come up with very innovative solutions that improved our service offerings for our clients. He was given a full-time position as a Business Technical Analyst. In my company, you only grow if you add value and I believe my leadership approach motivates my employees to be on top of their jobs and keep getting better.

Another interviewee, Lead 18 was asked the same question above and he replied:

I lead by showing my employees the example. It would be unfair for me to demand what I have not shown myself. I also work with them when they are having challenges. Even those who have been with us for more than 10 years will agree that I regularly make sure that employees learn fast on the job and are well equipped to achieve their daily activities.

Therefore it can be concluded that the majority of the respondents see the actions of their managers a factor that influences their jobs. In addition, there is still a significant number of respondents who are unwilling to provide additional time to their companies to get a task completed because of their managers.
Table 7.5.3: Perceptions Using the Work Experiences of Respondents and the effect of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are many times my manager puts my interest before his/her own</td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not mind spending extra hours coming on a weekend to ensure a task is completed because of my manager</td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I do not trust my manager, I cannot work effectively with him/her</td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of leadership I receive is important to my work performance</td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The actions of my manager influences the way I do my job</td>
<td>1-11 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years and above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation
7.5.4 Respondents Positions, Servant Leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Table 7.5.4 shows the findings in relation to staff positions within their companies. In response to the statement to ascertain if there were many times when the respondents’ managers put the respondents’ interest before theirs, 59% of the respondents who were junior employees agreed. On the contrary, nearly a third of these respondents (31%) said they felt their managers did not consistently have their personal interest as their major concern. When this enquiry was made to respondents at mid-level positions, it revealed that 37% of the respondents agreed that there were many times their managers put their interests first. Interestingly, a higher number of respondents at mid-level positions (50%) disagreed, which means that there were many times when their managers only focused on their personal interests. An almost equal proportion of respondents who are senior ranked employees agreed and disagreed. Of the 35 senior employees who responded to the statement “There are many times my manager puts my interest before his/her own”, 14 of them (40%) agreed to individual interests being their managers’ focus as compared to 16 of the respondents (46%) who disagreed to this. This clearly shows that the majority of the respondents who felt their managers focused on their personal interests were the junior employees. The findings also suggest that more mid-level employees felt their managers did not put their interests as a significant aspect of their working relationship with employees. This finding corroborates with the views of 3 out of 20 business leaders interviewed. As the General Manager in the hospitality industry put it:

*I always make sure that junior employees see their interests are met so they desire to grow in this company.*

Similarly, another interviewee, who is the CEO of an ICT company, Lead 7 said:
I lead by focusing more on the junior staff in my company. As a leader of my company for 10 years, I have learnt that when I closely pay attention to the needs of the junior staff, it gives me a big picture of how employees generally are feeling about their jobs and the company.

According to the Managing Director of Student Recruitment, Lead 15 in a large private university stated:

Spending most of my time with the junior workers in my unit is important in my leadership. I want them to grow and giving them support as they begin their jobs I believe will help them a lot.

Furthermore, just above half of the respondents (54%) who were junior staff confirmed that they would not mind spending extra hours on a weekend to complete their task because of their managers. This was quite similar to the responses from mid-level staff of which, 58% of them agreed that they were willing to work extra hours on a weekend to support their managers. Similarly, a significant number of senior level staff (66%) stated that they were willing to provide surplus work hours on weekends because of the interest they had in their managers. These results evidently show that senior level employees were the most willing to work on weekends because of their managers. However, it also reveals that an average number of junior and mid-level employees were willing to make such work commitments. However, these findings were not correspond with the responses from 20% of the business leaders interviewed. This implies that even though a recurrent theme in the interviews was a sense amongst interviewees of their appreciation for committed employees, their comments did not reflect much of the employees' willingness. For example, the Principal Consultant of a consulting firm, Lead 6 alluded to the notion of working extra hours with the statement below:

I lead by example and I make sure that my supervisors and senior executives follow the same path. There are weekends that I make sure we are all at work to brainstorm and plan on how to execute key projects,
When asked whether employees were willing to work extra hours to complete a project in the company, the General Manager of a technology software company, Lead 12 appeared to be displeased with the question. He replied:

> For the past 3 years, I come to work on Saturdays and there are many times I request that my heads of units come as well. A lot of staff in the company do not know the efforts and sacrifice I and my management team put to see that this company remains a successful one.

However, in response to the same question, the Managing Director of a furniture and carpentry servicing company stated:

> I work extra hours myself on certain days and I expect my senior staff to do just the same, so their team members can see and be encouraged to take ownership of a task till completion.

Therefore it can be concluded that the association between individual initiative, employee self-development due to the influence of leaders. It can also be established that organisational loyalty, and helping behaviours as demonstrated through the practice of servant leadership are significant factors that have an effect organisational citizenship behaviour. For this reason, the second hypothesis (H2b) which states that:

> There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience, and staff positions) and the effect of servant leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour is accepted.
Table 7.5.4: Perceptions Using Respondents Positions and the effect of Servant Leadership on Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are many times my manager puts my interest before his/her own</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not mind spending extra hours coming on a weekend to ensure a task is</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed because of my manager</td>
<td>Mid-level Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If I do not trust my manager, I cannot work effectively with him/her

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Junior Staff</th>
<th>Mid-level Staff</th>
<th>Senior Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I do not trust</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my manager, I cannot</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work effectively</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with him/her</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The kind of leadership I receive is important to my work performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Junior Staff</th>
<th>Mid-level Staff</th>
<th>Senior Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The kind of leadership I receive is important to my work performance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actions of my manager influences the way I do my job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Junior Staff</th>
<th>Mid-level Staff</th>
<th>Senior Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The actions of my manager influences the way I do my job</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation
So far this chapter has focused on the characteristics of servant leadership in relation to leadership effectiveness, the effects of servant leadership on job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour. The following section presents the research findings of the third objective which involves examining the effects of culture on the application of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies.

7.6. Culture and Servant Leadership

Tables 7.6.1 and 7.6.2 show a list of statements that depict significant aspects of culture and ratings from respondents. Also, Table 7.6.3 presents statement illustrating Ubuntu in relation to ongoing practises in the companies studied. It can be seen from Table 7.6.1 that responses to the statement “I do what my manager tells me to do without questioning him/her” generated a statistical calculated mean of 3.95> and standard deviation of 1.062. It also shows that a very significant 74.8% of the respondents who stated that they did not question their managers. Similarly, when the respondents were asked on whether they could contribute their suggestions to their managers if they had an opposing view, a majority of 73.3% stated that they could not share their personal opinions with their managers if they held contrary views to those of their managers. These findings show clear evidence that employees did not feel they had the freedom to provide any criticism to their managers. This goes to show that most of the respondents fully accepted their managers’ ideas without making their own contributions. Out of the 285 respondents who participated in this study, two-thirds of them (66%) said that their managers were not genuinely interested in their individual and personal achievements. This finding tends to correspond with the answers respondents gave to the statement “My manager strives to see that I get appropriate benefits from my company” where 69.8% of the respondents disagreed to this statement. This implies that the majority of the respondents do not believe that their managers have their growth and personal
development as their primary concern. When the element of gender equality was brought up, the findings show that the level of career growth were equal to some extent as women were promoted just as men. Furthermore, out of the 285 respondents, 177 respondents (62.1%) claimed that they had a clear understanding of what their managers expected from them. This finding suggests that the majority of the business leaders in private sector companies are effective in communicating what their expectations and desired outputs are from their employees.

Table 7.6.1 below shows answers from respondents to the statement “My manager expresses himself/herself whenever he or she feels like”. This statement was aimed at identifying whether the culture of the companies investigated reflects a leadership style in which leaders communicate expressively without control or paying attention to other key attributes of Servant Leadership as Listening, Empathy and Healing. A very significant number of respondents (85.6%) agreed to their managers expressing themselves whenever they felt like without considering how the employees felt about their responses. When asked on whether their managers shouted at them openly and often used derogatory words in communicating with them, an overwhelming majority of the respondents (77.9%) were undecided. However, a small number of respondents (8.8%) agreed to their managers shouting at them and often making use of derogatory words, while another small minority of respondents (17%) disagreed. This implies that majority of the respondents were most likely unwilling to provide concise responses to the statement. Moreover, more than half of the respondents (55%) agreed that their managers spoke to them with a sense of decorum and mutual respect. However, nearly one-third of the respondents (32.3%) disagreed. In relation to a culture of recognition within the organisation, a low number of respondents (19.6%) agreed that they received rewards from their manager for excellent performance on their jobs. In contrast, a very significant number of respondents (68.8%) maintained that they did not receive rewards.
from the managers for an effective carrying out of tasks. This pinpoints that a majority of employees stated the non-existence of effective reward practices by their business leaders. This therefore reflects the kind of leadership practices that have become culture within these companies. Especially, as these findings do not correspond with a number of comments from the business leaders interviewed that rather suggest the implementation of effective reward and recognition schemes in their companies. For example, the female CEO of a vibrant Training company, Lead 3 with a high young workforce described the culture within her company by stating:

Staff recognition and reward is a way I let my employees know that I value their dedication to duty and the company does too. We also like to encourage a culture where staff can express themselves and feel that they are leading the company too.

It was significant to observe the CEO of a Telecommunications company, Lead 18 take some time to reflect on this question asked to him: How often does your company recognise staff? He replied:

Once every year, HR sends me a budget to review based on the company’s projected reward goal to approve. Each year, we have certain targets for each departments and we reward staff who meet those targets or have shown very good efforts. As a leader of this company, I don’t see staff recognition as a liability but as an investment.

A similar question was asked to Lead 20, who is a female Managing Director of a technology company. This time, she was asked, is there a policy in place within your company that rewards staff, and could you please tell me how it works?

Yes there is. This company was formed with the employees in mind too. We have a company incentive plan which looks at the performance appraisals of staff. Because employees are graded in the appraisals, there are different bonuses for Grade A+ - Grade C+. Loyalty to the company and outstanding performance are always recognised the whole year through promotions and sometimes cash awards. For me, I like to lead a culture where employees sense the company’s appreciation of their efforts.
When the statement was posed “My manager strives to see that I get appropriate 
benefits from my company”, less than one-quarter of the respondents (21.7%) felt their 
managers had the drive to ensure they received suitable benefits from their companies, 
a highly significant number of respondents (69.8%) disagreed. This implies that the 
majority of the respondents did not see their business leaders as leaders who made 
considerable efforts to see that they were rewarded for exceptional work function and 
enjoy essential benefits from their companies. However, despite the absence of 
effective reward and recognition schemes, an overwhelming majority of respondents 
(90.1%) agreed that they receive encouragement from their managers to improve on 
their work performance. The collectivist element of Nigeria is culture and which was well 
reflected in the answers given by respondents when they were questioned as to 
whether a mutual bond existed in their companies between them and their colleagues. 
More than two-thirds of the respondents (87.7%) agreed that they had developed and 
sustained a mutual bond with their colleagues. This finding evidently suggests a 
collectivist culture that is prevalent in Nigerian private sector companies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (S)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Undecided (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do what my manager tells me to do without questioning him/her</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I bring in my suggestions to my manager when I have an opposing view</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am encouraged to be loyal to the teams’ objectives than to my personal goals in my company</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In my company, I take full responsibility for my actions</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In my company, the need to maintain status quo by getting things done in order is more prevalent than risk taking and innovative ventures</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My manager is genuinely interested in my individual/personal achievements</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>In my company, men are more likely to become managers than women</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have a clear understanding of what my managers expectations of me are</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager expresses himself/herself whenever he or she feels like</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager shouts at me openly and often uses derogatory words</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager gives a lot of attention to solving current problems</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager spends a lot of time in planning for the future</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager speaks to me with a sense of decorum and mutual respect</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I get rewarded by my manager for excellent performance of my job tasks</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my company, I am encouraged to improve on my performance</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager strives to see that I get appropriate benefits from my company</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my company, there is a mutual bond between my colleagues and me</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my company, there is little or no team spirit</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (S)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Undecided (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I receive direction from my manager on how to achieve my tasks</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I receive required resources from my manager to enable me to accomplish my tasks</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I relate with my manager as though he/she were a family member</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 My manager sees himself/herself as part of the team</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I receive full attention to my problems from my manager</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 My manager values team contribution</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My manager respects me as a person</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Fairness is promoted by my manager</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 My manager’s decisions are dependent upon the collective agreement of the unit/department</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 My manager respects the elderly within my unit/department</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation
Table 7.6.2 above reveals through the calculated statistical mean of 3.47, and a Standard Deviation (SD) of 1.012 that approximately half (50.1%) of the respondents agree that they receive direction from their managers on how to achieve their tasks. However, it is important to report that a significant number of respondents (35.8%) provided neutral responses as to whether they felt their managers provided direction on how they can accomplish their tasks. Also, 14.1% of the respondents stated that they did not receive direction from their managers as it relates to their tasks. These findings do not significantly confirm those of the interviewees, of which 14 out of 20 of the business leaders interviewed frequently used the term “direction” to illustrate their leadership style.

For example, Lead 3 said:

*I am far ahead of my team so that I can clearly set the goals they need to execute, and at the same time show them the direction they should follow.*

Similarly, Lead 14 asserted:

*For me, I lead by showing the way and I spend a lot of time showing my team members the direction the company is headed and how best the way they work can help us reach our objectives. I see myself as a leader of vision and this is what I think enables me provide direction to my team. It is frustrating when employees have no clear idea of what to do and where the company is going to. I bridge that gap and bring in clarity to the day to day activities in my company.*

The table also highlights through a derived statistical mean of 3.67 and a standard deviation of 1.07 that the respondents received the required resources from their managers to enable them accomplish their tasks. It shows that a very significant number of the respondents (69.5%) agree to be beneficiaries of necessary support from their managers to achieve their tasks. This correlates with the premise by the CEO of an Estate and Property company, Lead 9 who stated:
As the CEO of this company, I make sure that employees are given all the required support they need from their heads of units because I cannot demand high performance from my employees, when a workable framework has not been put in place to enhance their work output. As much as I require efficiency from my employees, I always hold their heads of units and supervisors accountable first, because these employees cannot deliver what they have been trained for.

Furthermore, Table 7.6.2 reveals through a calculated mean of 3.7> and a standard deviation of 1.03 that a highly significant number of the respondents (71.2%) attributed the kind of relationship they had with their managers as that of a family member. This demonstrates the collectivist nature of the organisation, even though a low number of respondents (13.7%) disagreed to relating with their managers as though he or she were a family member. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents (74.4%) felt their managers saw themselves as part of the team. This theme generated a statistical mean of 3.81> and a standard deviation of 0.956. It can be illustrated from the table through a mean of 3.67> and a standard deviation of 0.991 that a significant number of respondents (69.4%) agreed to receiving full attention from their managers regarding their problems. Also, a calculated statistical mean of 2.92< and an Sd of 1.076 strongly indicates that a large minority of respondents (39.8%) agreed that their managers valued team contribution, while more than half of the respondents (52.3%) confirmed that their managers did not value team contribution. However, this does not corroborate with the statements made by most of the leaders. For example, **Lead 16** describes the culture of his organisation by asserting:

*The culture of this organisation is such that we all work together as a family to achieve our common objective. My leadership style shows itself as I for one see myself as a builder of people. I bring my teams to work together and create brilliant ideas that would help our company grow at the centre of a lot of business competition. I like my employees to think for themselves and share ideas. This company has a culture of great team spirit and dedication to duty.*
The theme of respect within culture was revealed through a calculated statistical mean of 3.74> and a standard deviation of 0.943 which indicates that the majority of the respondents (74%) felt their managers respected them individually. Remarkably, the calculated statistical mean of 2.86< and a standard deviation of 1.056 proves that a high majority of the respondents (60.3%) claimed that the decisions made by their managers were not dependent upon the collective agreement of the team. This indicates the lack of delegation in decision making processes from leaders to followers.

This section has found that there exists a culture in which employees do not freely make their personal suggestions to their leaders. It also revealed that the objectives of the team supersedes the personal goals of the individual employees. In addition, it showed that most leaders so not take full responsibility for the actions of their employees and that majority of the employees were not of the perception that their leaders were genuinely interested in the personal goals of their employees. Also, a Pearson correlation test was deployed to test the level of significance of the results.

Table 7.6.3: **Pearson’s correlation test for hypothesis 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q39</th>
<th>Q41</th>
<th>Q44</th>
<th>Q51</th>
<th>Q52</th>
<th>Q53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.125*</td>
<td>0.229**</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7.6.3 above highlights the different sample correlation coefficients after synthesizing Q37 to Q54 in relation to the effects of culture (as shown in the Appendix 2.1). For example, for Q39, the sample correlation coefficient, $r = 0.053$, for Q41, $r = 0.086$. Also for Q44, $r = 0.052$, for Q51, $r = 0.125^*$. Q52 has $r = 0.229^{**}$ and for Q53, $r = $
0.098. As a result, it can be seen from Appendix 2.1, that most of the correlation coefficients have corresponding p-values that are less than 0.01 and 0.05 respectively, so therefore the null hypothesis $H_0$ which states that: “There is no positive relationship between the effect of culture and the application of servant leadership” can be rejected.

From Appendix 2.1, respondents perception on whether the culture in their companies was such that they could bring in suggestions to their managers if they had an opposing view resulted to (Q38) $r = -0.024$. The effect of this result shows that it is very unlikely for employees to bring in suggestions to their managers. On the contrary, perceptions regarding loyalty to team objectives than personal goals (Q39) resulted to $r = 0.053$ which is statistically significant and suggests that managers are more likely to encourage employees to be loyal to team objectives rather than personal goals.

Interestingly, a very high level of significance was generated from Q40, where $r = 0.300^{**}$. This indicates that a very high tendency of employees to take full responsibility for their actions and not their managers. Similarly, the result showed that men were more likely to become managers than women, as Q43 generated an $r =0.147^*$. This shows a positive level of significance and occurrence. A moderate level of significance was derived when the responses on perceptions as to whether the employees had a clear understanding of their manager’s expectations of them. For Q44, $r = 0.052$ which is moderately significant. However, this finding is different from the respondents’ perceptions of whether they received a lot of attention from their managers in solving their current problems. For this, Q47, $r= -.125^*$. Also, for Q49 which revealed perceptions as to whether managers spoke with a sense of decorum and mutual respect, $r = -0.109$. These results indicate that employees are less likely to receive help from their managers in solving problems. In addition, it also suggests a lesser tendency for managers to speak to their employees with a sense of decorum and mutual respect.

All these observations provide evidence to accept the alternative hypothesis (H3) that
there is a significant relationship between culture and servant leadership. The test results therefore signify that there is a significant correlation between the effects of culture on the application of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. So therefore, the alternative hypothesis, $H_a$: There is a positive relationship between the effects of culture and the application of servant leadership.

7.7 Servant Leadership and Employee Performance

As shown in Table 7.7.1, out of the 285 respondents who took part in the survey, 76.5% of them said that their emotional and mental wellbeing had not deteriorated in working with their managers. However, an insignificant number of respondents (9.1%) disagreed. This indicates therefore, that the majority of the respondents identify their working relationship with their managers as not a key element that affects their emotional and mental well-being. Even though, more than half of the respondents (51.6%) felt they had developed a positive mindset in working with their managers. This notion did not seem to reflect in the development of their decision-making ability as only over one-fifth of the respondents (21.8%) agreed to an improvement in the decision-making ability due to the influence of their managers.

Responses to the statement, “My manager allows me make certain decisions on my own” show that while nearly half of the respondents (48.1%) disagreed to this statement, 43.8% of them agreed. This implies that at least half of the respondents did feel that business leaders were giving them the opportunity to make decisions that relate to their work functions and the objectives of their company. However, this does not correlate with a few statements made by the business leaders. For example, the female CEO, Lead 3 whose training company has been responsible for nationwide staff training and development programmes for the major banks in Nigeria stated:
I lead my employees by making them leaders too. I normally have strategy sessions with employees at every level and at some point, I leave them to think and come up with their own ideas. Most of the best ideas that my company has implemented over the years have come from such meetings, and for me leadership I think is about influence.

When the CEO of an Estate and Property company, **Lead 9** was asked who the key decision-makers in his company were, he said:

*I am the overall decision-maker. However, I give my staff the opportunity to think and be active in the decision making of this company a few times. From my experience as a leader of this company, I have seen that employees tend to be more involved on a project when they feel they are part of the decision makers.*

In response to the same question, the CEO of a telecommunications company replied by first describing what he called his leadership mantra. He remarked:

*My leadership mantra is that I do not know it all. For this reason, I give opportunities for employees, both junior and senior to be active in certain decision making for the company. For example, my company was thinking of a business partnership with another top telecommunication company in Belize. Even though I am the CEO of the company and my decision stands, I wanted to be sure that it was a deal worth venturing into. At the end of strategy meetings with heads of units, junior executive staff and technical analysts in the company, I had to call of the deal. The projections in terms of profitability were not in our favour, so I was glad I allowed my people think and that they came up with a wonderful decision for the company. The good part of it all, was that that company in Belize went bankrupt 11 months later. What if I had not listened?*

Furthermore, the majority of the respondents (59%) stated that they would be motivated to achieve their career and personal objectives because of their managers, while less than one-third of the respondents (28.5%) disagreed. This indicates that the majority of the respondents see their managers as key to their motivation towards the achievement of their personal and career objectives. Also, when the respondents were asked if they like to serve others, 68.7% of them agreed to their willingness to serve others. On the contrary, out of the 285 respondents, only 157 of the respondents (55.4%) agreed to
want to help team members as much as they could. Furthermore, just about half of the respondents (49.8%) agreed that their managers are very concerned about their titles, while a significant 35.1% were undecided. However, less than one-fifth of the respondents (15.1%) stated that their managers were not very concerned about their titles. This finding indicates that there is a high number of business leaders in Nigerian private sector companies that are more concerned about leadership as a title as compared to leadership as a function. In support of this, an insignificant number of the business leaders interviewed (5%) alluded to this finding. For example, the Principal Consultant of a consulting company, Lead 6 stated:

*I really don’t care about the position of me as a leader. I am more concerned about my responsibility as a leader. My experience in leading my employees has taught me that if I keep focusing on my title as a leader and commanding respect from my employees, I would keep leading from my head and not from my heart.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Undecided (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My emotional and mental well-being has not deteriorated working with my manager</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have developed a positive mindset working with my manager</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My decision-making ability has improved by working with my manager</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have become more knowledgeable in working with my manager</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager allows me make certain decisions on my own</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated to achieve my career and personal objectives because of my manager</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help team members as much as I can</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My level of confidence has increased because of my manager</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to serve others</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is very concerned of his/her title as leader</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher's Compilation
Table 7.7.2: Pearson’s correlation test for hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Q48</th>
<th>Q49</th>
<th>Q51</th>
<th>Q52</th>
<th>Q53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.125*</td>
<td>0.229**</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation

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

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

For hypothesis 4, servant leadership is the dependent variable, while employee performance represents the dependent variable. Following this, Table 7.7.2 reveals the different sample correlation coefficients after synthesizing Q37 to Q54 in relation to the effects culture on employee performance (as shown in Appendix 2.1). For example, for Q48, $r = 0.076$. Q52 has $r = 0.229**$ and for Q53, $r = 0.098$. As a result, it can be seen from Table 7.7.2, that most of the correlation coefficients have corresponding p-values that are less than 0.01 and 0.05 respectively, so therefore the null hypothesis $H_0$ which states that: “There is no positively significant relationship between employee performance and servant leadership” can be rejected. The test results therefore signify that there is a significant correlation between servant leadership characteristics, job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour and the effects of culture on employee performance in Nigerian private sector companies. In testing hypothesis 4, the tests of hypothesis 1 to 3 were of significant value. Since hypothesis 1 to 3 have been confirmed, this study draws upon the conclusion that $H_4$: There is a positively significant relationship between employee performance and servant leadership is accepted.
7.8 Conclusion

This chapter provided an analysis of all the findings from the data derived from 285 respondents to the questionnaire and the interviews with 20 managers in the companies investigated. While the majority of questionnaire respondents were males (185), a good number of females (103) answered the questionnaire. In addition, only the business leaders were interviewed. These business leaders consisted of 6 CEOs, 5 Managing Directors, 4 General Managers, 3 Heads of Units/Departments, and 2 Principal Consultants.

The findings from the data collected were categorised in line with the four main research objectives. The first objective investigated the characteristics of servant leadership/personal traits of a servant leadership in relation to leadership effectiveness. The key findings indicated a positive association between servant leadership characteristics and the factors that influence leadership effectiveness. For this reason, the first hypothesis $H_1$: There is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/person leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness in Nigerian private sector companies was confirmed.

The second objective was categorised into two (2) major themes and provided findings after investigating the effects of the application of servant leadership on (a) Job Satisfaction and (b) Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB). Perceptions of respondents relating the above-mentioned themes were analysed based upon four (4) variables namely; Gender, Age, Work Experience and Staff Positions. The major findings indicate that even though both male and female respondents' value too highly their personal need for job satisfaction, certain elements of job satisfaction were not effectively practised by their current business leaders, especially those that had to do
with the leaders’ personal interests as against the interests of their employees. In addition, different results generated from respondents based on their age group, work experience and staff positions confirm H2a which stated that: **There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience, and position) and the effect of servant leadership on job satisfaction.**

Also, in relation to organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB), it was found that there is a significant gap in terms of the self-sacrificial component of servant leadership which appears to be less prevalent in the private sector companies in Nigeria. It has also become a source of debate as to whether the evidence of organisational citizenship behaviour as demonstrated by the respondents and emphasised by the business leaders are actually caused by other factors motivated by fear rather than genuine commitment. Therefore, H2b: **There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience, and position) and the effect of servant leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour** is confirmed.

The third objective of the study is the investigation of the effect of Culture on the application of Servant Leadership. The major findings from the results show the impact of culture on leadership. In addition, there was a test of H3 which states that: **There is a positive relationship between the effects of culture and the application of servant leadership** was confirmed after the use of the Pearson’s correlation test and the results from calculated statistical means and standard deviations. This finding has suggested that culture is a dominant factor to be considered in exploring how servant leadership can be applied in Nigerian private sector companies.

The fourth and concluding objective investigated the effects of servant leadership on employee performance. To achieve this, it examined if the perceptions of respondents on the characteristics of servant leadership being influenced by culture would lead to job
satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour; and whether the overall outcome would be enhanced employee performance due to the interactions between all the variables aforementioned. It therefore draws its conclusion based upon the argument that a positive and significant relationship between H1-H3 could lead to H4. As a result, 

H4: There is a positively significant relationship between employee performance and servant leadership is confirmed.

In conclusion, the findings revealed that there is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/person leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness, a significant relationship between demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and staff positions and the application of servant leadership on job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour. Furthermore, it also revealed that Culture has a significant relationship with the application of servant leadership and that Servant leadership has a positively significant relationship with employee performance. The next chapter provides a discussion of the findings as it relates to previously reviewed literature.
Chapter Eight: Discussion of the Findings

8.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide a discussion on the research findings in relation to the literature reviewed earlier including the socio-economic and political context of Nigeria. The discussion will result in the development of a theoretical model that can be utilised to explain the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies and serve as a framework for better understanding of leadership practice from an African perspective.

8.2 Servant Leadership Characteristics and Leadership Effectiveness.

The first objective of this study sought to determine the nature of the relationship that exists between servant leadership characteristics/person leader traits of the servant leader and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness. It was found that there is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/person leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness. This implies that the characteristics of servant leadership or personal traits of the servant leader which include: Listening, Empathy, Healing, Awareness, Persuasion, Conceptualization, Foresight, Stewardship, Commitment to the growth of people and Building community reflect leadership characteristics which make a leader effective based upon employees’ perceptions.

Even though the characteristics of servant leadership are based upon the philosophical construct yet regarded as a contemporary leadership approach known as servant leadership, they hold a strong correlation with what the respondents consider to be vital attributes of an effective leader. Prior studies on the characteristics of servant leadership have examined these characteristics in terms of providing contextual
definitions rather than explaining the implications they have on the organisation and workforce (Greenleaf, 1977; Spears, 1995; Russell and Stone, 2002; Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006).

Most of these studies did not deploy the use of empirical methods to validate the possible connection between the characteristics of servant leadership and the perceptions employees’ have of leadership effectiveness in the Nigerian private sector. This largely reflects the insufficient amount of research on servant leadership in relation to the Nigerian private sector. The findings reveal that the characteristics of servant leadership that are more apparent in the Nigerian private sector are Vision, Conceptualisation, and Awareness. Even though the perceptions of respondents allude to the fact that employees in the Nigerian private sector identify servant leadership characteristics as integral to leadership effectiveness, it was found that listening, empathy, healing, persuasion, stewardship and growth were less apparent. This is broadly consistent with the view of Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) who identified the strong relationship between listening skills and leadership effectiveness. Although the results indicate that some business leaders were actively involved in listening to their employees; their practice of listening is undermined by the evidenced fact that majority of the employees do not receive a great sense of encouragement at work from their leaders. Therefore, this finding does not broadly confirm the study of servant leadership by Marquez (2010) who referred to empathy as a leadership attribute which enables the servant leader to understand the emotional state of their followers in order to lead them. A possible explanation for the lack of listening and empathy may be explained by the fact that the cultural characteristic in Nigeria is largely dependent upon power distance structures (Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness, 2004). Therefore, the implication of this might be the inability for leaders to listen effectively to employees’ concerns.
Another important finding was that many employees did not see their leaders to be empathetic and interestingly, the results from the interviews revealed a trend in which only a few business leaders referred to elements of empathy and healing in their leadership style. This finding does not support the evidence from the observations of Malunga (2009) who identifies empathy as a key African value which a true leader demonstrates. There is further evidence from the results suggesting that private sector companies in Nigeria are more vision-oriented than service-oriented. It seems possible that these results are due to the fact that the Nigerian culture is high power distance culture, which implies that the focus of leadership would be on competency and achievement (Branine, 2011).

The findings of this study revealed that the leaders had vision, but employees did not see themselves as being part of the vision or given the opportunity to create their own vision to support the objectives of their companies. The consequence of this practice is evidenced in the low level of innovation and creative ability of employees. Even though many business leaders emphasised on how their employees were part of the vision and are innovative change agents within their companies, it raises the question as to whether they are change agents because they only listen and comply to what the business leader desires or whether they are actively involved in the initiation and implementation of ideas. This finding is not in agreement with Mitchell (2015) who described the vision of a servant leader as one that is not mediocre but compelling and fully engaging of followers.

It has been also found that the current leadership style of business leaders in Nigerian private sector companies is one in which the leaders use authority rather than persuasion and this creates a matrix of compliance rather than commitment, of enforcement rather than involvement. This stems from the African cultural value system in which employees are expected to have absolute respect for authority. The origin of
this however, was illustrated by the GLOBE (The Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness) (2004) study from which Dorfman et al., (2012) speculated that existent leadership practice in Africa reflects the cultural mechanism of the past in which Colonialism enforced authority. This was because the colonial quest of Great Britain did not only lead to the unification of the northern and southern protectorates into a country known as Nigeria, but also the initiation and implementation of new power structures for Nigeria (Eric, 2016).

Therefore, culture can be considered as an imperative factor that influences leadership characteristics, styles and behaviours in Nigeria. The analysis of this study found evidence that self-interest rather than individual interest of team members was the predominant focus of the majority of the business leaders in the Nigerian private sector. This is contrary with the view of Cerit (2009) who identified commitment to growth as a dominant characteristic of the servant leaders who seeks to enhance the personal and professional development of their followers. The impact of business leaders focusing on the growth of their employees has proven to be of immense benefit to the organisation as Trastek, Hamilton and Niles (2014) argued that the servant leader’s commitment to employee growth increases trust and boosts team performance. Another significant finding of this study is the emphasis by business leaders on their drive to develop their team members. However, this appears to only be of interest to the company and is broadly inconsistent with the view of Yoshida et al., (2014) who argued that the personal goals of the servant leader become subsidiary to the goals of the followers and the active objective of the servant leader is to place the interest of the followers as primary concern. Despite the claim by a few business leaders of their commitment to promoting reward and recognition of their employees, the responses from the majority of employees have proved that this is not the case in practice. Therefore, the current leadership practice by business leaders in the Nigerian private sector disagrees with
Russell and Stone (2002) who identified recognition of the human value and employees’ input to the organisation as a way in which leaders lead effectively by empowering followers. This research provides evidence that current reward and recognition schemes in the private sector companies in Nigeria are non-existent or at the most less effective. This is an area that business leaders need to consider improving upon because employee recognition and rewards are connected to the employees’ emotional state. This call for improvement in reward and recognition policies or schemes is consistent with the view of Lefton (2012) who pinpoint the significance of employee appreciation within an organisational culture as a way of decreasing employee turnover, enhancing employee motivation and morale and increasing job satisfaction. The leader has a fundamental role to play if the culture within private sector enterprises in Nigeria is one that not only initiates but implements effective recognition policies. This standpoint broadly supports the work of Russell and Stone (2002) who stated that a servant leader’s ability to recognise employees makes employees feel empowered and valued in the organisation.

This study has also found that most business leaders in the Nigerian private sector companies do not lead by demonstrating the characteristic of stewardship. This is not in agreement with the suggestion by Russell and Stone (2014) who argued that stewardship in servant leadership is demonstrated by the leader’s willingness to pursue partnership over patriarchy. They also proposed that stewardship emphasises the need for the leader to be accountable for the well-being of the organisation by leading the followers through service rather than control. Similarly, the finding of this study corroborates with Van Dierendonck’s (2012) recommendation that stewardship is reflected by the leader’s ability to serve others. These views on stewardship supports evidence from previous observation that have described the culture of Nigeria as one void of regional rivalry until
the post-colonial era where more communities began to feel marginalised due to leadership imbalances (Afigbo, 1991).

Therefore, this research proposes that business leaders in Nigeria rethink on their current practice and imbibe a culture of stewardship to develop organisational trust, boost motivation, enhance employee engagement and instil a sense of belonging to the organisation. This proposition is broadly consistent with the findings of Peterson et al., (2012) whose study on leadership characteristics and the performance of firms in USA argued that stewardship improves leader-follower bond that can lead to organisational effectiveness. Also, the proposition of this research finding strongly correlates with the findings of Liu, Hu and Cheng (2015) who after investigating servant leadership in the Chinese public sector recommended that stewardship in practice can make followers effective stewards of the organisation.

Moreover, it is possible, therefore, that the conformist culture in Nigeria is the reason for the less prevalent practice of fundamental servant leadership characteristics in private sector companies in Nigeria. This arguably may be due to the fact that businesses in Nigeria are predominantly driven by the leader of the business. In addition, despite the collectivist nature of the corporate enterprise in Nigeria, these findings provide strong evidence that suggests that the leader appears never to be seen as wrong within an organisational culture. Even though cultural societal expectations over the years have influenced the workforce and demand a leader who is seen as symbolising strength of character, strong and fully in control, this study has found strong evidence to suggest that it is possible that societal expectations are changing and employees (who constitute society) are beginning to demand for leadership attributes that focus on humane-orientation and are people-centric as the characteristics of servant leadership. For example, the introduction of the cultural endorsed leadership theories (CLTs) from the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness, 2004)
research project suggest a paradigm shift. This paradigm shift indicates that societal expectations across cultures tend to seek for leadership that is humane-oriented, value-based, participative, team-oriented, autonomous and self-protective.

8.3 Servant Leadership in relation to Job Satisfaction and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Several reports as Anderson, (2005); Van Tassell (2006); Hofman (2007); and Chavez (2011) have shown in the literature that a strong relationship exists between servant leadership and job satisfaction. The same claim has been made regarding organisational citizenship behaviour (Harwiki, 2013; Mahembe and Engelbrecht, 2014; Chiniara and Bentein, 2016). However, there is insignificant empirical study that investigates this association in relation to the Nigerian private sector. For this reason, the second objective of this study was categorised into two parts. It was designed to investigate the relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience, staff positions) and the impact of servant leadership on (1) job satisfaction and (2) organisational citizenship behaviour.

It has been found that the majority of both male and female respondents did not have close working relationships with their managers, despite the fact that 25% of the business leaders interviewed claimed that such relationship existed. This finding is consistent with the ideology of Socrates on the leader–follower relationship as identified by Tucker. Tucker (1997) argued that the philosophy of Socrates on leadership revealed the follower as an opponent. Moreover, a possible explanation could be based upon the fact that Nigeria has a highly masculinist culture. This then implies that business leaders tend to focus more on dominant values as ambition, assertiveness, wealth acquisition, performance, and caring less for others (Branine, 2011). As a result, this finding is in contrast with the foundational principles of servant leadership which Greenleaf (1977)
describes as one that begins with a natural feeling that a leader wants to serve the followers first.

It was also found that more females than males felt they were left out of the teams. A possible reason for this might be that the leadership of the Nigerian private sector is purely male dominated and that Nigeria, being a high masculinist culture, values as love and care, sustained personal relationships may be of greater concern to the female employees.

The study also revealed that across gender, age, work experience and staff positions of the respondents, there was a lack of team recognition from the leadership. It also showed the inability of a significant number of employees to develop new skillsets due to the motivation from their leaders. However, a significant number of respondents felt they had a chance to learn and grow under their current leaders. This finding is quite unexpected because the respondents had already suggested that they received inadequate motivation from their managers to acquire new skillsets, so it raises the question as to how employees can grow in their career without developing new competencies that equip them to meet the responsibilities of higher job roles within their companies which are different from previous job roles. However, the perceptions that respondents had on having a chance to learn and grow broadly corresponds with that of Carter and Baghurst (2014) who argued that employees felt a sense of growth due to the practice of servant leadership.

In relation to job satisfaction, the outcome of this study is contrary to that of Anderson (1995) who found a significant and positive relationship between servant leadership an employee job satisfaction. In addition, the absence of the servant leadership characteristic of commitment to the growth of people in relation to job satisfaction has been clearly indicated from the finding of this study. As such, this finding is inconsistent
with that of Van Tassell (2006) who argued that a leader’s commitment to the growth of his/her employees would increase the perceived job satisfaction of the employees. However, it is consistent with the view of Das, Rao and Reddy (2014) that servant leadership practice enhances the kind of motivation that improves job satisfaction.

This study has also found that self-focus and having self-interest as primary concern was a dominant behaviour demonstrated by the leaders. This result broadly disagrees with the findings of Dambe and Moorad (2008) who argued that servant leadership reflects an empowerment-dependent leadership rather than a control-focused leadership. Contrary to expectations, the study found that a sufficient number of respondents were willing to work extra hours because of their managers. This finding corroborates the ideas of Mahembe and Engelbrecht (2014), who suggested that servant leadership increases team effectiveness and increases employees’ commitment to work. Also, they were a few comments by business leaders supporting this claim. However, this study raises an argument that a possible explanation for this contradictory result is that leaders tend to use authority rather than persuasion, which creates a matrix of compliance rather than commitment. As such, this result suggests that the employees display organisational citizenship behaviour because they assume they do not have a choice or they also want to keep a good record with their leaders.

8.4 Culture and Servant Leadership

The discussion within this section relates to the findings on the third objective which investigated the concept of culture in relation to the application of servant leadership. Central to the entire exploration of servant leadership is the concept of culture. As a result, this section is an integral part of the research because the researcher suggests that to explore the role of servant leadership, an essential step would be to determine if servant leadership exists in the first instance. This research argues that to identify the
existence or non-existence of servant leadership in practice in Nigerian private sector companies, it is important to investigate the kind of culture that is dominant in these companies. This section explores how the Nigerian culture affects the practice of leadership. It has found the existence of a conformist culture. Also, it explains how the cultural dimensions of power distance, masculinity and individualism vs collectivism influence leadership practice.

The study shows that the majority of the employees did what their managers told them to do without questioning them. It indicates a culture of compliance as the employees’ views appear to be of little or no relevance to the decision-making process of the leader. This finding matches those observed in earlier studies such as that of Lippitt (1940) who argued that the control of decision-making by a dominant individual represents autocratic leadership. However, this finding is broadly inconsistent with that of Dwyer (2016) who identified the servant leader as one who empowers his or her leaders. Therefore, this research suggests that it may be difficult for employees to develop a sense of empowerment if they had no opportunity to question or constructively evaluate their leaders’ actions. However, it is interesting to note that this existing culture of compliance does not correspond with the principles of Ubuntu. Just as Mangaliso (2001) described Ubuntu as a pervasive spirit of caring and community, harmony and hospitality, respect and responsiveness, not control or dominance.

Similarly, another interesting finding was that a significant number of respondents did not feel they could share an opposing view with their managers. This finding is contrary to that of Greenleaf (1977) who stated that the first response of a genuine servant leader is to listen to the followers. This suggestion by Greenleaf corresponds with that of Patterson (2003) who viewed participation of followers in decision-making processes as a significant aspect of servant leadership. Moreover, this research argues that it is difficult to explain this result, because such existing leadership style does not reflect the
core African values of Ubuntu. For example, Ncube (2010) argued that the framework for Ubuntu leadership is necessitated by the leader having to inspire a shared vision. As the finding above does not appear to represent a shared vision but rather a singular vision; which is only the vision of leader as there is little or no participation from the followers. However, the findings are somewhat consistent with the views of Browaeys and Price (2008) who are argued that in a high-power distance culture, subordinates are totally dependent on their leaders and most times receive the blame. Also, they suggest that it is still possible to have effective leaders who are compassionate autocrats and yet unequivocally task focused and in full control.

Another important finding was that most of the respondents reported that they were encouraged to be loyal to the objectives of their teams or units rather than their personal goals within their companies. This result supports the findings of Ncube (2010) who argued that group outcomes were more important than individual goals in Africa. It is also consistent with that of Owusu et al., (2015) who identified interconnectedness and interdependency as vital components of the African culture of Ubuntu. However, this finding is broadly inconsistent with the views of Spears (1996) in which the servant leader focuses on the personal goals of his or her followers as dominant priority. A possible explanation for this might be that it simply reflects the collectivistic nature of the Nigerian culture, being very high on power distance.

Contrary to expectations, this study found that within the private sector, the business leaders were more risk-taking and encouraged innovation within their companies. Even though it supports the findings of Giolito and Van Dierendonck (2015) who noted that the communication style of a servant leader enhances innovation within the organisation, it also raises the question as to whether innovation within these companies is only a representation of the leader’s vision, and perhaps does not fully reflect the ideas of the followers. Furthermore, it supports the view by Spears (1995)
that the servant leader has the ability to dream great dreams and think beyond status quo to achieve higher dimensions of growth for the organisation. However, this finding suggests that private sector companies in Nigeria have the cultural dimension of low uncertainty avoidance and supports the findings of Chua (2013) that organisations with low uncertainty avoidance are more susceptible to change. This research argues that a possible explanation of why these business leaders are innovative and risk-prone may heavily rely upon the fact that the private sector is still a growing sector of the Nigerian economy and if it is to serve as a key player in transforming the Nigerian economy, it must be adaptable to change.

This research also found a significant increase in the number of respondents who felt that their managers were not genuinely interested in their individual achievements. This finding does not support the fundamental principles of servant leadership as Woodruff (2004) argued that the servant leader places the followers’ needs above his or her desires. It is also inconsistent with the views of Hale and Fields (2007) that a servant leader is so concerned about the growth of the followers to the point that it is placed above his or her own welfare. Furthermore, this finding does not support the previous research by Panaccio et al., (2015) who stated that the servant leader demonstrates a genuine level of concern to followers. Also, this finding is not a reflection of the culture of Ubuntu which Mangaliso (2001), had already described as a pervasive spirit of caring and community, harmony and hospitality, respect and responsiveness that individuals and groups display for one another. An explanation for this result could be that the Nigerian culture is less of a feminist culture and as such caring for followers aspirations may not be the focus of the leader. This explanation supports the argument by Branine (2011) who classified the feminist culture as one that upholds strong values of love and care for others.
It is interesting to note that this study found that males rather than females were more likely to become managers. This finding is not in contrast with the spirit of fairness that Ubuntu and Servant Leadership represent. However, this result may be explained by the fact that the Nigerian culture is more masculine than feminine and perhaps there is a societal expectation for a leadership that is seen as tough and assertive. This explanation strongly supports the views of Hofstede (2006) that men are supposed to be assertive, competitive and tough. Furthermore, even though the culture of Ubuntu upholds a spirit of caring, respect, solidarity and compassion, the head of the family unit is always represented as a man.

Another interesting finding is that the responsibility for outcomes and actions is to the follower and not the leader. This finding does not depict the true value of Ubuntu in which the team is represented as a family and the leader is the head of the family who is primarily accountable for the family. It also raises a question as to why the followers should be fully accountable for their actions if they were not involved in any form of decision-making. More practically, is there a justification for an employee to be held accountable for an unsuccessful task that he or she did without needed training or direction from the leader? This study argues that this finding tends to suggest that even though the leader in the Nigerian private sector is fully responsible for this vision, he or she receives no blame for negative outcomes. It suggests a leadership approach which is more directive than responsive and this could lead to a culture of absolute compliance and submission, and not one of commitment in which both the leader and followers take ownership.

In this study, it was found that there was not a prevailing culture that ensured the sustenance of reward and recognition mechanisms. Even though it noted, that they were business leaders who identified their zeal to reward exceptional staff, the results still showed a noticeable gap. This finding is inconsistent with the argument by Cerit
(2009) who identified a behaviour of the servant leader as the provision of opportunities to followers to enable them develop personally and professionally. It also does not corroborate with the findings of Hersey et al., (1979) that there is a positive association between increases in salaries, benefits and other forms of incentives to increase employee compliance. This view supports that of Yukl (2012) who argued that rewards are essential in enhancing employee performance. This research suggests that the reward culture within Nigerian private sector companies is a representation of their core company values and argues that these values serve as indicators of the values the leader has. Another possible explanation could be based on the proposition by Kuada (2010) that the African culture is such that business leaders adapt to the tendency of providing special opportunities and staff benefits to employees who are closest and highly compliant to them. This prerogative then raises a question as to whether those employees whom the interviewed business leaders claimed to have benefitted from the company’s incentive plan did so because of excellent performance or because of their closeness to their leaders. This research suggests that it could be a combination of both. This is due to the fact that one hand, the business leaders interviewed seemed to have a desire for professionalism and optimum employee performance. On another, it is important not to ignore the tendencies of African business leaders as described by Kuada (2010) above.

This study found that there was a good working relationship among employees in their companies. This finding supports the work of Hofstede (2006) who argued that collectivist cultures like Nigeria promote strong attachments of people to each other, which perhaps explains why team cohesiveness is an integral component of workforce in the Nigerian private sector. It is also in agreement with the work of Browaeys and Price (2008) that the collective achievement of the team rather than the individual accomplishment of a particular individual is the major focus of a collectivist culture.
The results of this study found in Nigeria that there was a culture in which the employees felt they could relate with their leaders as though they were family members. Even though this result does not support previous studies which indicated that many employees did not have close working relationships with their managers, it is consistent with those of Wanasika et al., (2011) who found that in Sub-Saharan African cultures like Nigeria, traditional values of group solidarity were expressed. This, they argued, is demonstrated through family, tribal loyalty, teamwork and reliability to internal groups.

Another finding which contradicts the collectivist nature of the Nigerian culture is that managers’ decision-making was found not to be dependent upon the collective agreement of the team. This finding confirms that of Wanasika et al., (2011) which associates managerial leadership in Sub-Saharan Africa to the factor of colonialism. They allude to the fact that the era of colonialism had institutionalised leadership structures which continued past the colonial era. They found that despite the end of the colonial-era, these African cultures have not fully disassociated themselves from the negative aspects of colonialism which was evolved around absolute command and control and as such tend to drift away from their traditional cultural values. Furthermore, a possible explanation for this finding corroborates with the views of Muczyk and Holt (2008) that there are certain cultures that are inclined to accepting hierarchical order and are reluctant to avoid structural chains of command.

8.5 Servant Leadership and Employee Performance

This part of the research is quite interesting because while the former sections of the research have the performance of the leader, this focuses on the performance of the employee. The discussion in this section relates to the fourth and final objective which was to evaluate the impact of servant leadership on employee performance in Nigerian private sector companies. This study was designed to determine the effects of the
above three objectives with the view of finding out if the expected outcome would be the fourth objective.

This study evaluated the impact of servant leadership on employee performance. It found that majority of employees felt their emotional and mental well-being of respondents had not deteriorated because of their managers. This finding does not support earlier finding which reveals that close working relationships are not prevalent between leaders and employees. However, this research attempts to provide a possible explanation for this. This research argues that there is a possibility that even though employees do not have close working relationships with business leaders, they do have significant and close working relationships with team members. This therefore suggests that employees may be benefitting more from team leadership which enhances their emotional and mental well-being. Thus, it supports the view of Morgeson et al., (2010) that team leadership represents the members of the team enhancing their effectiveness because of the satisfaction they derive from working together. Another finding of the study was the decline in the decision-making ability of the employees. This finding reinforces the fact that decision-making process within Nigerian private sector companies is centralised at the leadership level and points to an autocratic leadership approach. Furthermore, this finding is broadly consistent with Beugre (1998) who argued that decision-making could be repressive due to the high level of centralised power structures in African modern organisations.

What is surprising is that the study also found that there was some level of participation between the leaders and employees which allowed the employees to make certain decisions on their own. This finding confirms the argument by Okojie (2015) that the more leaders engage employees to participate in organisational activities, the easier it is to effectively achieve organisational goals. However, Okojie (2015) developed another argument in reference to the Nigerian workforce by stating that there are situations
where the leader needs to adopt the autocratic leadership style to improve performance and behavioural issues of employees.

The study found that a very significant number of employees were rather self-motivated to achieve their career and personal objectives, than leader-motivated. Therefore, this suggests that business leaders in Nigerian private sector companies did not have a culture of empowering employees. This finding is not consistent with that of Trastek, Hamilton and Nile (2014) who found that there is a positive association between the servant leaders concern for the growth of the followers and a high level of employee performance. However, this research suggests that leaders’ involvement in motivating their employees to achieve their career and personal objectives could improve the work relationships between leaders and employees. This suggestion is strongly corroborated by the views of Gittell (2003) who explained how servant leaders in Southwest Airlines used to power of relationships to attain high performance. He also found that the implementation of shared goals, respect and appropriate communication made the relationship effective. However, this research argues that Gittell’s (2003) observation of Southwest Airlines is only a demonstration of the American culture. It therefore raises the question as to how effective work relationships cannot be fully researched if the cultural forces of the workforce are ignored.

The analysis of the data related to employee performance found that a significant number of employees stated that they would like to serve others within their company. This research suggests that the practice of servant leadership would encourage a spirit of stewardship and improve employees’ performance on their job roles. This assertion is consistent with the study of Liu, Hu and Cheng (2012) who found that the practice of stewardship from servant leaders influences their followers to do the same.
In summary of the above discussions, it is conclusive that there is a positive and significant relationship between the characteristics of servant leadership and employees' perceptions of leadership effectiveness. It can also be concluded that the demographic variables of Gender, Age, Work Experience and Staff Positions have a significant effect on the application of servant leadership on job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour respectively. Furthermore, culture emerged as a reliable predictor of the application of servant leadership. Finally, conclusions have been drawn to suggest that a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics, job satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviour and culture would lead to an outcome of increased employee performance.
8.6 The Development of a Theoretical Model

*Figure 8.1: Theoretical Model for exploring the role of Servant Leadership in Nigerian Private Sector Companies.*
The diagram above (Figure 8.1) represents a theoretical model that has been developed from the discussion of this research on exploring the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. The model develops a linkage regarding the first three hypotheses and introduces a possible outcome. The model illustrates how the association between servant leadership characteristics/attributes and traditional African values can lead to a culture that enhances the demonstration of job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviours. This model concludes by identifying how these linkages would lead to an employees’ increased performance within a corporate enterprise.

The model has identified the characteristics of servant leadership that are dominant and those that are less prevalent in Nigeria. It indicates that the dominant characteristics of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies are Vision, Conceptualisation, Foresight and Awareness. However, the less prevalent characteristics of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies are Empathy, Listening, Healing, Persuasion, and Stewardship. As a result, the majority of the business leaders do not have a commitment to the growth of their employees. Likewise, they are not committed to the building of society as findings suggest that the major priority is ensuring their personal visions are achieved by getting employees to accomplish their individual and team tasks.

This model shows that the low occurrence of servant leadership characteristics of empathy, listening, healing, persuasion, stewardship, commitment to growth of employees and building society are not a true representation of the traditional leadership value systems which were in existence in Nigeria before the colonial era. The neglect of Africa’s traditional humanistic leadership value systems was attributable to the emergence of leadership by enforcement and inflexible power structures implemented through colonial rule. In between this transition, team-oriented leadership
and followers values as solidarity, compassion, protection of each other’s interest, respect and dignity were gradually been lost. The culture of interdependency gave way to a culture of dependence on the leader-king (Malunga, 2009).

8.6 Conclusion

This chapter has addressed the four research objectives set for this research using the findings of the statistical analysis provided. This chapter set out to investigate the extent to which servant leadership characteristics/personal leader traits influence employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness in Nigerian private sector companies. As prior studies had not investigated the characteristics of servant leadership in relation to Nigerian private sector companies, it was interesting to find that vision, conceptualisation, foresight and awareness were the most prevalent characteristics existing. It also found listening, empathy, healing, persuasion, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people and building community as less prevalent, yet in existence. In addition, the research identified a strong association between the perceptions of these servant leadership characteristics to the cultural practice in Nigeria. A major issue that arose from the discussion was the impracticality of disassociating the influence of culture from servant leadership practice in Nigeria.

Another aspect of this chapter was to discuss the findings after examining the effects of the perceptions from the demographic variables of gender, age. Work experience and staff positions on the application of servant leadership to job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour. Even though most research on job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour are not in relation to the African culture, this research identified some immediate dependable conclusions, based on responses that indicate that servant leadership if practiced in in Nigerian private sector companies, could enhance job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour.
This chapter revealed that the conformist, masculine and high in power distance culture of Nigeria has a significant impact on current leadership practice. It also indicated that the true representation of Africa's humanistic culture has not been very evident in current leadership practice in Nigeria. As a result, it draws upon the argument that the effects of the colonial era has to a large extent dictated the culture driven by business leaders. Therefore, it showed how culture would significantly affect servant leadership practice. In addition, it bridged the gap in most leadership research that tend to explore the concept of leadership without discussing the concept of culture.

This chapter concluded by seeking to understand the impact of servant leadership on employee performance. As indicated in the theoretical model with the support of literature, it advanced and confirmed the hypothesis that tested if the overall outcome of cultural influences on perceptions of leadership effectiveness through servant leadership characteristics, would not only lead to increased job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour, but eventually result to enhance employee performance.
Chapter Nine: Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

Having developed and presented the theoretical model from the discussion of the study’s findings, this chapter explains the contribution of the research to knowledge in theory and practice. Furthermore, it presents the practical implications of this study and makes recommendations. Finally, the limitations of the study are discussed and proposals for research are made.

9.2 Summary of the main issues

This research set out to explore the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. The primary aim of this research was to develop a theoretical model for understanding how servant leadership can be effective in Nigerian private sector companies. This model would also serve as an instructional platform for understanding leadership from African perspectives. The motivation behind this research emerged from the fact that the current leadership challenges in the private sector needed to be addressed, as the private sector is integral to Nigeria’s economic and social development. In addition, another motive behind this research was that even though there is a growing number of literature on the contemporary theory of servant leadership, there is scarcity of literature on servant leadership from African perspectives. More so, this research is a response to the existing theoretical and practical gaps in leadership research in the private sector of Nigeria. Meeting the objectives of this research would make it possible to better understand the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies.

This study used a mixed methods research to obtain data from respondents in Nigeria. For quantitative research, surveys through the use of questionnaires were employed as primary instruments for data collection. As a result, a total of 394 questionnaires were
sent to the private sector companies that formed the sample population. Of the 394 questionnaires distributed, a total of 285 were received. This indicates that a response rate of 72.3% was generated. The qualitative aspect of this research involved the use of semi-structured interviews with 20 business leaders. These business leaders consisted of 6 Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), 5 Managing Directors (MD’s), 4 General Managers (GM’s), 3 Heads of Units/Departments and 2 Principal Consultants. In addition, this study adopted the triangulation mixed methods design which involved testing the results of the quantitative data using the SPSS version 23 against the qualitative data, before the findings were interpreted.

The following four hypotheses were proposed, tested and confirmed:

**H1** - There is a significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics/person leader traits and employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness.

Findings from this research confirmed an acceptance of a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics and leadership effectiveness. However, it also found that some servant leadership characteristics were dominant while others less prevalent in relation to current leadership styles of business leaders in Nigerian private sector companies. The more dominant characteristics of servant leadership were Vision, Conceptualisation and Awareness. However, the less prevalent characteristics of servant leadership were empathy, listening, healing, persuasion, stewardship and commitment to the growth of the people. For this reason, a concluding explanation for the less prevalent practice of fundamental servant leadership characteristics ascribes to the conformist culture that is predominantly driven by business leaders.
H2a - There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and staff positions) and the application of servant leadership on job satisfaction.

Overall, the results demonstrate that the practice of servant leadership has a positive and significant relationship to job satisfaction. It reveals that females felt more left out of their teams which are predominantly led by male leaders. It also pinpoints a moderate level of close working relationships with business leaders. This research has provided evidence indicating that employee growth and development was weak in Nigerian private sector companies as business leaders tend to be more focused on self-interest than the well-being of their employees. This however, has no correlation with the foundational principles of servant leadership in which a servant leader demonstrates a genuine level of concern for followers. Also, the research found that even though employees are keen on improving their skillsets, they do not get the required motivation and support from their leaders. Moreover, this finding also indicates that career progression was ineffective and unstructured.

H2b - There is a significant relationship between the demographic variables (gender, age, work experience and staff positions) and the application of servant leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour.

A significant finding from this study is that trust was essential for employees demonstrating organisational citizenship behaviours. This research also shows that majority of employees were unwilling to spend extra hours at work. However, these employees worked extra hours probably because of fear for the leader, of their jobs or to improve close working relationships with their leaders.

H3 - There is a positive relationship between the effects of Culture and the application of Servant Leadership
The research objective regarding culture is of fundamental importance to this entire study. One of the significant findings to emerge from this research is that the culture within Nigerian private sector companies was a culture of compliance rather than a culture of commitment. Furthermore, this culture of compliance is demonstrated by the leaders’ use of authority rather than persuasion. As such, the outcome of this is that it constructs a matrix of enforcement rather than involvement.

This clearly supports the findings of a culture that the researcher terms as “Leader is never wrong syndrome”. This term signifies a culture in which employees tend to always agree with business leaders. The outcome of this practice is a workplace where the business leaders face no constructive criticism. It has become very evident from this research that leadership practice in Nigerian private sector companies has a lot of resemblance to the cultural elements of the past in which Colonialism imposed authority. However, this research found that such behaviour does not align with the core traditional African value system of Ubuntu which is symbolised by a shared value system, care, and interconnectedness. It also does not reflect African cultural value in which the leader represents the head of the family or tribe and the individual who does not eat until everyone in the family has eaten. Therefore, this paradigm shift is a continuation of colonial influence of administration rather Africa’s philosophy of leadership centred on humanistic values. The implication of this, is that what was always known as Africa’s indigenous leadership philosophy “Ubuntu” has lost its core strength in current leadership practice. Therefore, this philosophy of humanness that integrates Africa’s culture and into a communal enterprise has been lost to a culture driven by a hierarchy of command and control mechanisms.

The results of this study show that the team objectives are just a duplicate of the leader’s vision. Therefore, it is not a common culture for employees to develop their objectives and goals, but simply achieve those of their leader. This also pinpoints that
business leaders in Nigerian private sector companies are more vision-oriented than people-oriented. Even though vision for example, is an important characteristic of servant leadership, the kind of vision that servant leadership endorses is one that involves the committed participation of followers. To achieve this commitment, the servant leader employs the characteristic of persuasion to ensure the willingness of employees towards intended projects. On the contrary, the control mechanism is still prevailing in leadership practice in Nigeria, and so does the vision of the leader prevail.

**H4-** Servant Leadership has a positive and significant relationship with employee performance.

This study has found that the prevalence of servant leadership characteristics is closely related to employee’s level of job satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour. Furthermore, it revealed that the application of servant leadership characteristics could lead to a culture that is more servant-oriented and increase employees’ performance due to maintenance of such culture.

**9.3 Contribution of the Study to Knowledge**

The findings of this study provide great insight on the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. As a result, it has made the following contributions:

**9.3.1 Contribution to Theory**

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, there is no study of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector. This study is to fill in this gap. To the knowledge of the researcher, this study represents the first exploratory and explanatory study on the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies. Also, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, this study is a novel attempt that provides a new and robust
understanding of the effect of culture on servant leadership practise in the Nigeria. As a result, this is the first study to find that:

1. Servant leadership is not practised in Nigerian private sector companies; as one of the more significant findings to emerge from this study suggests that leadership in Nigeria private sector is predominantly autocratic and moderately democratic in nature.

2. Autocratic leadership due to the effects of colonialism is a major barrier to the practice of servant leadership in Nigeria. However, a re-enactment of African cultural values as solidarity, collective enterprise compassion, protection of each other’s interest, respect and dignity could enhance such synergy that may lead to an effective application of servant leadership in Nigeria;

3. Servant leadership could be applicable in Nigeria but in a way that is culturally acceptable and realistic. The review of the Nigerian culture in this study would provide new understanding that should help to improve the predictions of the effects of culture on servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies;

4. Servant Leadership is a universal concept is questionable. If the debate on the application of servant leadership is to be moved forward, then a better understanding of the multi-faceted nature of culture in relation to servant leadership needs to be developed. Based on this, this study suggests that an arguable weakness of studies on servant leadership is investigating servant leadership with a worldview knowledge rather than from distinctive cultural perspectives.

This study contributes to the historical debates concerning servant leadership by exploring the theory from an African perspective. Likewise, this thesis represents a significant and substantial contribution to the advancement of knowledge of servant leadership in Africa. Therefore, the originality of this research can be represented in the
research question of: Does servant leadership exist in Nigerian private sector companies? After synthesis of literature and identifying relevant gaps, data collection and analysis, these findings would provide new perspective on servant leadership. International researchers would have the opportunity to gain information for their comparative studies that relate to the political, cultural, economic, social and historical synopsis of Nigeria. This research contributes to the academic body of knowledge as it closes the gap on the understanding of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies.

A central contribution to knowledge is the development of a theoretical model. This model identifies key moderating and mediating factors and provides a practical way for servant leadership practise in Nigerian private sector companies. The model recommends what it terms as THE 12 tribes leadership development program which for organisations which would be used to drive a service-oriented culture. A lot of researchers have suggested that servant leaders develop and produce more servant leaders, but they fail to state how. The rationale behind the 12 tribes leadership program is for all new and existing employees to be part of the 12 tribes leadership program. If change processes within companies commence with change in belief systems and perspectives, every employee needs to be involved. The new employee would benefit by knowing early the cultural values and operating philosophy of the company. The junior employee would be well equipped for the future. Middle cadre employees who are close to holding leadership positions would be prepared. Similarly, TMTs (Top Management Team Members as CEOs (Chief Executive Officers), MDs (Managing Directors), Heads of Departments, would benefit from this program as it would reshape their thinking and position them to lead by serving, not by enforcement. They would identify the need to utilise soft leadership skills as coaching, mentoring, persuasion,
group interactions, assertiveness and persuasion as their power mechanism. The implication of this is a reduction of the use of coercion.

Furthermore, this model suggests that for servant leadership to be effective in Nigerian private sector companies, organisational leaders need to practise more the less prevalent characteristics of servant leadership by promoting a more team-oriented work culture. This could come in the forms of:

i. Unbiased strategy meetings

ii. Avoid hierarchical abuse of power. (This research suggests that because of the traditional culture of Africa which emphasises respect for the elderly and for those in power; removal of hierarchies could be ineffective. However, the hierarchical order should not be abused, and leaders are encouraged to have open door policy’s at all management levels in order to build leader trust and organisational trust)

iii. Improved reward and recognition policies

iv. More involvement in corporate and social responsibility

v. Improvement in internal team bonding and corporate events [it is important the business leaders show their appreciation to employees. There is a need for business leaders to adopt a culture where they do not only inform employees on what to do but to also hear what the employees really want.

9.3.2 Contribution to Practice

The findings of this research have implications for an extensive range of stakeholders. On one hand, it will serve as an instructional platform for organisational leaders in the private sector. All those involved in leadership capacity such as CEOs, Managing Directors, General Managers and Heads of Units, just to mention a few would be able to benefit from the findings of this research in enhancing their leadership practice. On the
other hand, on a macro (national) level, the findings of this research would equip labour policy makers as the recommendations developed within this research would further inform their understanding of leadership from a Nigerian perspective and guide them in the initiation of policies for the Nigerian private sector. Another practical contribution is that it would provide a reorientation on leadership thinking processes across all sectors of industry as management consultants and would see this research as a template in their organisational development programmes.

The findings of this research will be of interest to foreign investors as it will serve as a prototype for investors who are determined to establish servant leadership as their organisational core operating philosophy. The influx of foreign investment in Nigeria calls the need for understanding the effects of culture on servant leadership. This research provides a template that would make foreign investors in their decision making on leadership practices and people management.

The empirical findings of this study would extend the knowledge of leadership programmes in business schools on leadership in Africa. In addition, leadership consultants would find this research useful. The interest in leadership development is rapidly growing as African countries are keen on developing the next generation of leaders with the right skillsets and competencies. This study could become a model that informs educational programmes in Africa on leadership and management.

9.3.3 Dissemination

9.4 Limitations of the study

Since the culture in Africa is similar to a great extent, most of the findings may be applicable to other African countries if generalised to other sectors of the economy of the other African countries.

This study was also limited by external factors. As at the time, the data was being collected, the political and economic climate of Nigeria was tense due to political quagmires and the insolvency of some major governmental establishments by the federal government in Nigeria. In addition, there were security concerns in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja due to the insurgence by terrorists in Northern Nigeria. All these made it impossible to gain access to other companies that would have contributed to the study.

Many employees were unsure of confidentiality. Despite the fact that letters of consent from the University and evidence of the researcher’s commitment to safeguard their information was shared with them.

The sample could have been bigger, and the response rate could have been higher if it was possible to gain commitment/participation of a large number of employees.

A limitation of this research was that it covered only respondents in Abuja. For this reason, it has insufficient data to determine, if the research would have generated different results if conducted in different regions of the country. However, notwithstanding these limitations, this thesis would contribute immensely by providing deeper insight into servant leadership study from African perspectives.
9.5 Proposals for Further Research

Even though this study has made significant contributions in its investigation of the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies, it has identified areas for possible future research. They are as follows:

1. Future research might be needed that explores the public sector, since the findings from this research reveal the role of servant leadership in Nigerian private sector companies only.

2. The theoretical model developed from this study could be extended by a similar investigation in other African countries, especially the Francophone speaking African countries in order to provide a comparative analysis. It would be interesting to compare the experiences of employees within the private sector companies outside Nigeria.

3. This research has thrown up many questions of culture in relation to servant leadership from an African perspective. Another possible area of future research would be to investigate the reliability of the findings of the GLOBE study in relation to the African culture.

4. It is possible for future research to be undertaken to test the relative impact of the theoretical model developed from this research. As this study is the first major in-depth research of servant leadership and Nigerian private sector companies, there was no model to measure against.
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### Appendix 1.1: Factor Analysis (Using the bivariate correlation matrix)

#### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Q19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pearson Correlation

- **Q1**: 1 0.096 0.009 0.182″ 0.034 0.000 0.145′ -0.019 .287” 0.049 .131 ′ .159” .123 ′ 0.061 0.099 -0.101 -0.135 ′ 0.011 0.080
- **Sig. (2-tailed)**: 0.105 0.884 0.002 0.573 0.014 0.749 0.000 0.413 0.028 0.007 0.037 0.305 0.096 0.088 0.023 0.859 0.177

#### Pearson Correlation

- **Q2**: 0.096 1 0.095 0.187″ 0.096 -0.084 -0.138 0.064 0.108 - 0.043 .211″ 0.005 -0.039 0.053 -0.116 0.013 0.009 -
- **Sig. (2-tailed)**: 0.105 0.108 0.001 0.106 0.159 0.020 0.280 0.069 0.698 0.473 0.000 0.939 0.508 0.368 0.051 0.826 0.881 0.374

#### Pearson Correlation

- **Q3**: 0.009 0.095 1 0.095 0.082 .206″ 0.049 0.098 0.065 0.037 0.072 0.084 0.030 0.050 .189″ -0.043 -0.079 -0.134 ′ 0.024
- **Sig. (2-tailed)**: 0.884 0.108 0.111 0.170 0.000 0.409 0.099 0.272 0.532 0.227 0.156 0.614 0.401 0.001 0.472 0.183 0.024 0.681

#### Pearson Correlation

- **Q4**: .182” .187″ 0.095 1 .152 ′ 0.044 -0.004 -0.087 .222 ′ -0.025 0.083 .274 ′ 0.092 -.165 ′ .326 ′ -0.054 0.003 .181 ′ 0.051
- **Sig. (2-tailed)**: 0.002 0.001 0.111 0.010 0.458 0.948 0.144 0.000 0.672 0.161 0.000 0.012 0.005 0.000 0.367 0.957 0.002 0.392

#### Pearson Correlation

- **Q5**: 0.034 0.096 0.082 .152 ′ 1 -0.002 0.021 0.102 0.058 0.032 -0.063 .175 ′ -0.056 -.001 .177 ′ -0.021 0.009 0.082 0.088
- **Sig. (2-tailed)**: 0.573 0.106 0.170 0.010 0.979 0.718 0.085 0.332 0.596 0.293 0.003 0.350 0.991 0.003 0.730 0.883 0.166 0.139
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>.206”</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.125†</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.287”</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>.222”</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>.174”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.131†</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>.187”</td>
<td>.219”</td>
<td>.174”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 386 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
### Appendix 2.1: Factor Analysis (Using the bivariate correlation matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q37</th>
<th>Q38</th>
<th>Q39</th>
<th>Q40</th>
<th>Q41</th>
<th>Q42</th>
<th>Q43</th>
<th>Q44</th>
<th>Q45</th>
<th>Q46</th>
<th>Q47</th>
<th>Q48</th>
<th>Q49</th>
<th>Q50</th>
<th>Q51</th>
<th>Q52</th>
<th>Q53</th>
<th>Q54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>.147**</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-1.25'</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>.125'</td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.123'</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-0.292**</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.227**</td>
<td>-0.167**</td>
<td>-0.204**</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>-0.188**</td>
<td>-0.176**</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.307**</td>
<td>-0.232**</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>-0.216**</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>-0.184**</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.301**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>-0.123'</td>
<td>-0.307**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.135'</td>
<td>.330**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>-0.232</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44 Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>-.227**</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.191**</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>-.183**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-.167**</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-.205**</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.125'</td>
<td>-.204**</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.178**</td>
<td>-.250**</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>-.201**</td>
<td>.212'</td>
<td>-.133'</td>
<td>.130'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>-.268**</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>-.160**</td>
<td>-.140'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 285
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q51</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-0.108</th>
<th>0.008</th>
<th>-0.061</th>
<th>0.024</th>
<th>-0.060</th>
<th>0.029</th>
<th>-0.069</th>
<th>0.023</th>
<th>0.069</th>
<th>.323**</th>
<th>.228**</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>-.154**</th>
<th>0.057</th>
<th>-0.044</th>
<th>.209**</th>
<th>-0.097</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.153**</td>
<td>-.223**</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-.201**</td>
<td>-.160**</td>
<td>-.154**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.333**</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-.475**</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.125’</td>
<td>-.188”</td>
<td>-.184”</td>
<td>.216”</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-.178”</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>.212”</td>
<td>.140’</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-.333”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.312”</td>
<td>-.221”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.229”</td>
<td>.176”</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>.135’</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>.131’</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-1.13’</td>
<td>.117’</td>
<td>-.205”</td>
<td>-.133’</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-1.143’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.301”</td>
<td>.330”</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>.164”</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>.130’</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>.209”</td>
<td>-.475”</td>
<td>.312”</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>0.100</th>
<th>0.218</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>0.059</th>
<th>0.777</th>
<th>0.113</th>
<th>0.547</th>
<th>0.006</th>
<th>0.780</th>
<th>0.028</th>
<th>0.100</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>0.499</th>
<th>0.084</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q54</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.157''</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.172''</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.183''</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.129'</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-0.221''</td>
<td>-0.143'</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

392
Appendix 3.1: Sample of Questionnaire

**HOW TO PROVIDE YOUR FEEDBACK?**

Kindly indicate your level of agreement to the following items. Please read each item carefully, and then tick (v) at the box which best matches your personal view (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree).

**SECTION 1: LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOURAL DIMENSIONS**

Question 1: What is your evaluation of the leadership behaviours you have observed and experienced yourself?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>My views and complaints are always listened to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>I have developed a close working relationship with my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>I do not hesitate to approach my manager if I have a personal problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>I am sure my manager understands what the company’s goals are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>I see my manager as one who can think out of the box and develop new ideas to solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>I see my manager as a leader with vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>I see my manager as one who has full awareness of what is going on in the company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>There are many times my manager puts my interest before his/her own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>I am given the opportunity to make decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>My manager takes the blame for a task which I was responsible for and corrects me later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>I feel left out of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>My manager encourages myself and team members to think of innovative solutions that would lead us towards our unit’s objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>I am convinced that my manager wants me to reach my best potential in life, and not just as it relates to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>My manager acknowledges the team for a job well done and not himself/herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>I receive a great sense of encouragement and moral support from my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>I feel threatened at feedback sessions I have with my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>I have been able to acquire new skillsets and competencies because of the motivation I received from my manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>My manager thinks of himself first before anyone else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>I see my manager as one who is more keen on protecting his own interests than that of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>I have become a better team member because of the example of my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 2: APPRAISING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

**Question 2:** What is your assessment of employee performance in relation to leadership?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>I get easily demotivated if I am confused of what tasks I am to undertake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>The actions and decisions of my manager influence the way I carry out my job functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>I would not achieve optimum productivity if my manager is not interested in my output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>I have a great chance to work, learn and grow under my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>I do not mind spending extra hours/coming on a weekend to ensure a task is completed because of my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>My manager makes me more innovative at my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>There is good communication and great teamwork in my company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>I am encouraged to share my ideas with my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>I would consider my company as a high performing company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>The core values of my company align with my personal values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>If I do not trust my manager, I cannot work effectively with him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>I have work/life balance at my current job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Good communication and great teamwork exist in my company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>If I am satisfied with my work, it would positively influence my output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>The kind of leadership I receive is important to my work performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>The actions of my manager influences the way I do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 3: A DIAGNOSTIC ANALYSIS OF THE ELEMENT OF CULTURE

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>I do what my manager tells me to do without questioning him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>I bring in my suggestions to my manager when I have an opposing view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>I am encouraged to be loyal to the teams’ objectives than to my personal goals in my company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>In my company, I take full responsibility for my actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>In my company, the need to maintain status quo by getting things done in order is more prevalent than risk taking and innovative ventures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>My manager is genuinely interested in my individual/personal achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>In my company, men are more likely to become managers than women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>I have a clear understanding of what my managers expectations of me are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>My manager expresses himself/herself whenever he or she feels like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>My manager shouts at me openly and often uses derogatory words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>My manager gives a lot of attention to solving current problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>My manager spends a lot of time in planning for the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>My manager speaks to me with a sense of decorum and mutual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>I get rewarded by my manager for excellent performance of my job tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>In my company, I am encouraged to improve on my performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>My manager strives to see that I get appropriate benefits from my company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>In my company, there is a mutual bond between my colleagues and me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>In my company, there is little or no team spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 4: SERVANT-LEADERSHIP AND THE UBUNTU LEADERSHIP APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>I receive direction from my manager on how to achieve my tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>I receive required resources from my manager to enable me accomplish my tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>I relate with my manager as though he/she were a family member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>My manager sees himself/herself as part of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>I receive full attention to my problems from my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>My manager values team contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>My manager respects me as a person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Fairness is promoted by my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>My manager’s decisions are dependent upon the collective agreement of the unit/department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>My manager respects the elderly within my unit/department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 4: SERVANT-LEADERSHIP AND EXPLICIT EMPLOYEE OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>My emotional and mental well-being has not deteriorated working with my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>I have developed a positive mindset working with my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>My decision making ability has improved by working with my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>I have become more knowledgeable in working with my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>My manager allows me make certain decisions on my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>I am motivated to achieve my career and personal objectives because of my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>I want to help team members as much as I can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>My level of confidence has increased because of my manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>I like to serve others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>My manager is very concerned of his/her title as leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participants Details (Please circle that which provides your best answer)

**Gender:** Male  Female

**Age:** 18-25  26-35  36-45  46-55  55-65  Over 65

**Length of Employment with this Organisation:** 1-11 months  1-3 years  4-7 years  8 years and above

**Unit/Department**
- Administrative  Technical  Sales/Marketing  Accounting / Finance  HR/Personnel  Others

Others. Please specify………………………………………………………………………………

**Position in Company**
- Junior  Middle  Senior

Others. Please specify………………………………………………………………………………

**Educational Background:** Secondary School  Diploma/Undergraduate  Masters’ degree  Doctorate

**Signature:**
## Appendix 4.1: Transcript of Interview Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audio File Code: 1302</th>
<th>Title: Doctoral Thesis Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee: Name withheld</td>
<td>Tag: Lead 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position: CEO, ICT company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Interview: February 20th, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: Doctoral Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interviewer:** Good morning sir, I will like to thank you once again for allowing me conduct this interview with you.

**Interviewee:** That’s ok.

**Interviewer:** Please tell me, a little about your company and your role here

**Interviewee:** Well… {clears throat}. My company is an ICT (Information Communication and Technology) company that is involved in diversified communication services, and we have 3 offices with our headquarters here in Abuja. I am the CEO and owner of this company. My company has been in operations for over ten years now, I will say.

**Interviewer:** Thank you very much for your response sir. In all your years as the leader of this company, what has been your motto?

**Interviewee:** In my company, we have a motto that “a happy staff is a productive staff”. As individuals, we all face challenges at certain times and I see it as my duty to help my team when they encounter personal challenges. The reason I do this is because I have seen employees lose their motivation to work because of a loss of a family member, inability to pay a child’s schooling fees on time or one major problem at a particular time. When I get involved in their problem, I believe they see our company as a caring company.