

**LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE**

**CHILAKA MARY EZINNE**

**MGS2104800**

**DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

**FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES**

**UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN-CITY.**

**NOVEMBER, 2025.**

**LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE**

**CHILAKA MARY EZINNE**

**MGS2104800**

**BEING A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF  
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES,  
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN-CITY, IN PARTIAL FUFILMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS OF THE AWARD OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.Sc)  
DEGREE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.**

**NOVEMBER, 2025.**

## **DECLARATION**

I, CHILAKA MARY EZINNE, with MAT NUMBER MGS2104800 hereby declare that, the Study is a research work undertaken by me in the Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, under the supervision of Prof. Ibrahim Shaibu this work has not been previously submitted for the award of any degree elsewhere. All ideas and views are products of my personal research and where the views of others have been expressed; they have been duly referenced and acknowledged.

---

**CHILAKA MARY EZINNE**

**MGS2104800**

---

**DATE**

## **CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that this research work titled, “**LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE.**” was carried out by **CHILAKA MARY EZINNE** with matriculation number **MGS2104800** in the Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City.

---

**PROF. IBRAHIM SHAIBU**  
**(PROJECT SUPERVISOR)**

---

**DATE**

---

**DR. S. A. ADEKUNLE**  
**(PROJECT COORDINATOR)**

---

**DATE**

---

**DR. D. O. OGBEIDE**  
**(HEAD OF DEPARTMENT)**

---

**DATE**

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this work to God Almighty, the source of my strength, wisdom, and inspiration.

To my loving parents, Mr Gregory Chilaka and Mrs Christiana Chilaka, for their unwavering love, support, and sacrifices throughout my academic journey.

To my siblings who stood by me in one way or another, your encouragement meant everything.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly, I give all glory and thanks to **GOD ALMIGHTY** for His guidance, grace, strength, and wisdom throughout the course of this project and my academic journey in te University of Benin. Without Him, none of this would have been possible.

My sincere appreciation goes to my project supervisor, **Prof. Ibrahim Shaibu**, for his invaluable support, guidance, constructive criticism, and patience throughout this work. Your direction has been instrumental in shaping this project.

My sincere appreciation to the Head of Department, **Dr. D. O. Ogbeide**, and to all the lecturers of the department of Business Administration, University of Benin, for the knowledge impacted, and tireless efforts at providing a conducive academic environment.

To my ever loving and supportive parents, **Mr Gregory Chilaka** and **Mrs Christiana Chilaka**, your unwavering love, prayers, encouragement, provision, and sacrifices have brought me this far. I'm endlessly grateful. My heartfelt gratitude also goes to my siblings **Miss. Chilaka Chizorom**, **Miss. Chilaka Chineye**, and **Mr. Chilaka Ikechi**, who have supported me in one way or another, thank you for trusting and believing in me. Not forgetting, **Rev. Fr. Emmanuel Etta**, for his prayers and kind words that continually inspired me.

Lastly, I thank my amazing friends, for the motivation, shared knowledge, companionship, and emotional support during challenging moments. You've all made this journey easier and more memorable.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER PAGE.....	i
TITLE PAGE .....	ii
DECLARATION .....	iii
CERTIFICATION .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	x
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Research Problem .....	4
1.3..Research Questions .....	6
1.4.Research Objectives.....	7
1.5.Research Hypotheses .....	7
1.6 Scope of the Study .....	8
1.7 Significance of the Study .....	9
1.8 Limitation of the Study .....	11
CHAPTER TWO .....	13
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	13
2.1 Introduction.....	13
2.2 Conceptual Review .....	13
2.3 Theoretical Review .....	27
2.4 Empirical Review.....	37
CHAPTER THREE .....	55
METHODOLOGY .....	55
3.1 Introduction.....	55

3.2 Research Design.....	55
3.3 Population of the Study.....	55
3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Technique.....	57
3.5 Operationalization and Measurement of variables .....	60
3.6 Data Collection Instrument.....	62
3.6.2 Reliability of the research instrument .....	63
3.7 Method of Data Collection.....	63
3.8 Method of Data Analysis .....	64
3.9 Model Specification .....	64
CHAPTER FOUR.....	66
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS .....	66
4.1 Introduction.....	66
4.2 Demographic Analysis.....	66
4.3 Descriptive Analysis of Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.....	69
4.4 Correlation Analysis of Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.....	82
4.5 Hypothesis Testing.....	85
4.6 Discussion of Findings.....	91
CHAPTER FIVE .....	95
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	95
5.1 Introduction.....	95
5.2 Summary of Findings.....	95
5.3 Conclusion .....	97
5.4 Practical Recommendations.....	98
5.5 Contribution to Knowledge.....	99

5.6 Suggestions for Further Studies ..... 99

REFERENCES ..... 101

APPENDICES ..... 107

APPENDIX I ..... 107

SECTION A: PERSONAL DATA..... 107

SECTION B: LEADERSHIP STYLES AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE  
..... 108

APPENDIX II..... 112

## ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance in the hospitality sector in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria, focusing on six selected hotels: Protea Hotel, Precious Palm Royal Hotel, Uyi Grand Hotel, Western Villa Hotel, Limoh Suites, and El-Hassani Hotel. The research adopted a quantitative survey design, and data were collected from 134 employees using structured questionnaires. The analysis was conducted using SPSS version 22, applying both descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis to assess the influence of five leadership styles—transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, autocratic, and participative—on organisational performance. The results revealed that transformational leadership had a strong and statistically significant positive effect on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.505$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), followed by transactional leadership, which also showed a significant positive influence ( $\beta = 0.220$ ,  $p = 0.021$ ). However, laissez-faire, autocratic, and participative leadership styles demonstrated positive but statistically insignificant effects, indicating that while they may be perceived as supportive, they do not contribute meaningfully to measurable performance outcomes in the hotel industry. The study recommends targeted investment in leadership development programs that emphasise vision, motivation, and innovation. The research contributes to the leadership-performance discourse by providing context-specific empirical evidence from the Nigerian hotel industry and calls for further investigation into sectoral and behavioural mediators of leadership effectiveness.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Background to the Study**

Organisational performance remains a central concern within the field of management due to its direct implications for sustainability, competitiveness, and growth in both private and public sectors. Organisational performance reflects the extent to which an organisation achieves its stated objectives efficiently and effectively, often assessed through metrics such as productivity, profitability, innovation, employee satisfaction, and customer retention (Bititci, 2015). Contemporary organisations are increasingly required to operate in volatile and complex environments where traditional metrics of success are insufficient. Instead, intangible performance indicators, such as knowledge capital, organisational learning, and strategic agility, have gained prominence (Carneiro-da-Cunha, Hourneaux Jr & Corrêa, 2016). Scholars have emphasized that performance is not merely a by-product of organisational resources but is significantly influenced by the quality of leadership and governance systems that direct these resources (Malhotra et al., 2025; Rufus, Festus & Dada, 2022).

Leadership serves as a foundational mechanism through which organisational values are enacted, strategies implemented, and resources aligned (Ulrich & Smallwood, 2012; Iszatt-White & Saunders, 2017). Leadership is not a monolithic construct; it is

multifaceted and deeply embedded in organisational culture, structure, and context. Effective leadership is particularly pivotal in driving organisational change, managing uncertainty, and fostering innovation (Guthrie & Davies, 2024;). In modern enterprises, the role of leadership is further magnified due to the shift from rigid hierarchical models to more fluid, network-based organisational structures where decision-making, motivation, and performance are increasingly decentralised (Velarde, 2023).

Leadership style, as a conceptual subset of leadership theory, is a paramount concept in organisational behaviour field, reflecting the behavioural patterns a leader adopts when interacting with subordinates. Prominent leadership styles include transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, autocratic, and participative approaches each associated with distinct organisational outcomes (Northouse, 2025; Stanley, 2022). Transformational leaders focus on vision, motivation, and fostering employee growth, while transactional leaders emphasize performance through structured rewards and penalties (Ansari et al., 2024; Dong, 2023). Laissez-faire leadership is characterised by minimal interference and delegation, often criticised for its potential to breed ambiguity and low accountability (Ahsan & Khalid, 2023; Leary & Miller, 2021). Conversely, autocratic leadership imposes top-down control, with swift decision-making but potential risks of employee disengagement (Sharma, 2022; Shaw, 2022). Participative leadership invites collaboration and shared responsibility, often linked to enhanced morale and creativity (Wang, Hou & Li, 2022; Jain et al., 2022).

The connection between leadership style and organisational performance is one of significant scholarly interest, as it may define the trajectory of organisational success or failure. Transformational leadership, for instance, is widely associated with improved employee commitment, innovation, and long-term growth, whereas transactional leadership has been shown to bolster short-term productivity and compliance (Mekonnen & Bayissa, 2023; Montano, Schleu & Hüffmeier, 2023). Autocratic leadership may enhance efficiency in crisis situations but may hinder participatory decision-making and employee satisfaction (Alsarrani et al., 2021; Shaw, 2022). Laissez-faire leadership, while granting autonomy, may lead to role ambiguity and reduced accountability if not effectively managed (Robert & Vandenberghe, 2021; Bwambale, Mulegi & Bulhan, 2024). Participative leadership has been credited for increasing employee engagement and fostering innovation, both of which are vital to sustained performance (Schermully et al., 2022; Wang, Hou & Li, 2022). However, these relationships are rarely linear or universally applicable; they may be contingent on organisational size, culture, industry, and the evolving expectations of stakeholders. Thus, while leadership style “may” influence organisational performance, the exact nature and magnitude of this influence remain contextually dependent and open to further academic inquiry. This complexity forms the basis upon which the present study is anchored.

## **1.2 Statement of the Research Problem**

The hospitality sector, particularly the hotel industry in Nigeria, is experiencing increasing operational complexities driven by heightened customer expectations, competitive pressures, and workforce dynamics. Despite being a significant contributor to local employment and economic activity, many hotels in this region continue to struggle with issues of low employee productivity, high turnover, inconsistent service quality, and suboptimal financial performance. These challenges raise fundamental questions about the leadership dynamics within these establishments, especially considering that leadership style has been widely acknowledged as a determinant of organisational success (Ng & Kee, 2011; Marr & Gray, 2012). Yet, there remains a limited understanding of how leadership is enacted in this sector and its influence on performance outcomes. This contextual situation creates a practical and theoretical need to examine whether the leadership styles adopted by hotel managers in Benin City significantly shape organisational performance within this vital but underexplored service sector.

Despite extensive scholarly attention on the influence of leadership styles on organisational performance, findings from previous studies remain mixed and inconclusive. While some researchers affirm a positive relationship between transformational, democratic, or transactional leadership styles and various organisational outcomes (Afolabi, 2023; Alade, 2022; Dim & Nzube, 2020), other studies present conflicting results. For example, Saasongu (2015) reported an insignificant effect of

transformational leadership in SMEs, and Lawal et al. (2014) found no meaningful link between leadership style and effectiveness due to entrenched power distance. Furthermore, Shafiu et al. (2019) argued that leadership practices may facilitate task completion but fall short of encouraging performance that exceeds expectations. These contradictions suggest that contextual variables such as organisational size, cultural norms, leadership constructs, and sector-specific dynamics may moderate the relationship between leadership styles and organisational performance. As such, there remains an urgent academic imperative to clarify these inconsistencies through studies that adopt comprehensive leadership frameworks and are grounded in specific organisational contexts.

A survey of the literature further reveals variables adopted gap. While some studies explore a wide range of styles such as autocratic, bureaucratic, charismatic, and participative others focus narrowly on one or two styles, with differing mediators or outcomes (Olayisade & Awolusi, 2021; Parveen et al., 2022; Kabir et al., 2016). This diversity in operationalisation has led to a lack of consensus and reduced the comparability of findings across studies. Moreover, research remains geographically and sectorally skewed toward industries such as oil and gas, education, health care, and manufacturing (Abubakar & Ahmed, 2021; Dim & Nzube, 2020; Ajibade et al., 2017), leaving a discernible empirical gap in service-based industries like hospitality. Particularly, there is a paucity of research examining the leadership-performance nexus in the hotel sector of Benin City, a commercially active urban centre with unique organisational and cultural

dynamics. This study, therefore, seeks to investigate the effect of transformational, transactional, autocratic, participative, and laissez-faire leadership styles on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City, thereby addressing a significant gap in leadership research and contributing to a robust understanding of sector-specific leadership efficacy.

### **1.3..Research Questions**

Arising from the above research problem, the following research questions are raised:

- i. How does transformational leadership influence organisational performance in hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria?
- ii. To what extent does transactional leadership affect organisational performance in hotels in Benin City?
- iii. What is the effect of laissez-faire leadership on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City?
- iv. How does autocratic leadership impact organisational performance in hotels in Benin City?
- v. In what way does participative leadership influence organisational performance in hotels in Benin City?

#### **1.4. Research Objectives**

The broad objective of this study is to examine the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance. The specific objectives include to:

- i. examine the effect of transformational leadership on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria;
- ii. assess the impact of transactional leadership on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City;
- iii. determine the influence of laissez-faire leadership on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City;
- iv. investigate the effect of autocratic leadership on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City; and
- v. evaluate the relationship between participative leadership and organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.

#### **1.5. Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses stated in the null form are raised to guide the study;

- i. Transformational leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.

- ii. Transactional leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.
- iii. Laissez-faire leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.
- iv. Autocratic leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.
- v. Participative leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.

### **1.6 Scope of the Study**

This study focuses on evaluating the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance using selected hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria, as a case study. The research is geographically confined to Benin City, a major commercial and administrative hub in Edo State, to ensure contextual relevance and feasibility. The study specifically examines the influence of five leadership styles including transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, autocratic, and participative on organisational performance within the hotel industry. The selected hotels include Protea Hotel, Precious Palm Royal Hotel, Uyi Grand Hotel, Western Villa Hotel, Limoh Suites, and El-Hassani Hotel. These hotels were chosen due to their large workforce, operational scale, and accessibility to the researcher. The study focuses on the year 2025 and utilise primary data collected through the

administration of structured questionnaires distributed to managerial and non-managerial staff within the selected hotels. This scope enables the study to generate contextually grounded insights on how leadership practices shape organisational outcomes in the hospitality sector of Benin City.

### **1.7 Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study extends to multiple stakeholders, including hotel management, employees, policymakers, investors, and academic researchers.

**Hotel Management:** For hotel managers and administrators, understanding the effect of various leadership styles on organisational performance is vital for achieving operational efficiency, service excellence, and competitive advantage. The study's findings will provide practical insights on which leadership styles foster higher performance levels within hotel operations. Managers can use these insights to adopt or refine leadership approaches that align with their organisational goals, improve employee motivation, and enhance service delivery standards critical to sustaining customer satisfaction and organisational success.

**Employees:** Employees in the hospitality sector stand to benefit from a deeper understanding of how leadership behaviours influence their work environment and overall performance. The study may reveal leadership practices that promote effective communication, empowerment, and collaboration, thereby creating a more supportive and

productive workplace. Improved leadership styles can lead to higher job satisfaction, lower turnover rates, and increased employee engagement factors that collectively contribute to the sustained performance and growth of hotel organisations.

**Policymakers and Industry Regulators:** For policymakers and industry regulators, the study offers evidence-based insights that can inform the formulation of leadership development programs and human resource policies within the hospitality industry. Understanding how leadership styles affect organisational performance will enable policymakers to design frameworks that promote ethical leadership, equitable workplace practices, and effective management standards. Such policies can help strengthen the performance and global competitiveness of Nigeria's hospitality industry while ensuring that leadership development remains a strategic national priority.

**Investors and Stakeholders:** Investors and other stakeholders in the hospitality sector can use the study's findings to make informed decisions regarding hotel investments and strategic partnerships. Since leadership effectiveness directly influences organisational performance, productivity, and profitability, identifying hotels with sound leadership practices can serve as a reliable indicator of long-term sustainability. The research can also help investors assess managerial risks, thereby promoting more strategic and data-driven investment decisions within the hotel sector.

**Academic Researchers and Scholars:** Finally, for academic researchers, this study contributes to the growing body of literature on leadership and organisational performance in the Nigerian context. It offers a theoretical and empirical basis for further investigations into leadership dynamics within service-based industries. Scholars can build upon the study's findings to explore cross-sectoral comparisons, refine leadership theories, and develop models suited to the evolving realities of the Nigerian and African hospitality industries. Moreover, the study enriches academic curricula by providing contemporary, context-specific insights that can guide leadership training and development for future managers.

### **1.8 Limitation of the Study**

While this study offers valuable insights into the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance within selected hotels in Benin City, Edo State, it is not without limitations. The study is geographically confined to a single urban area and a limited number of hotels, which may affect the generalisability of the findings to other regions or sectors. It focuses exclusively on five leadership styles including transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, autocratic, and participative thereby excluding other potentially relevant leadership constructs. Additionally, the cross-sectional nature of the data collected in 2025 does not allow for longitudinal assessment of leadership effects over time. The reliance on self-reported data from hotel employees and managers may also introduce

response biases, such as social desirability or recall bias, which could affect the reliability of the findings. Despite these constraints, the study provides a significant contribution to the body of knowledge on leadership and organisational performance in the Nigerian hospitality sector.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter is broken down into three sections. They are as follows: conceptual literature, theoretical literature, and empirical literature. The conceptual literature examines some concepts related to the subject matter, the theoretical literature examines some relevant theories related to the topic under study, and the empirical literature examines some previous studies that are closely related to this current study with their findings.

#### **2.2 Conceptual Review**

This section provides the conceptualisation of the dependent variable organisational performance, and the independent variable leadership styles alongside its sub-dimensions.

##### **2.2.1 Organisational Performance**

Organisational performance is a complex, multi-dimensional construct that reflects how effectively an organisation achieves its strategic objectives and sustains competitive advantage. Bititci (2015) defines organisational performance as the capacity of an organisation to deliver outcomes aligned with its strategic goals, while concurrently managing its internal operations and external relationships. This definition underlines the dual focus of performance: outcomes and processes. Ng and Kee (2011) further expand this understanding by asserting that performance encompasses not only financial outcomes but also intangible elements such as innovation, employee engagement, and intellectual

capital. Such views highlight a growing consensus that organisational performance cannot be reduced to financial indicators alone. Marr and Gray (2012) similarly argue that effective performance management requires a strategic alignment between objectives, key performance indicators, and organisational resources. According to Rufus, Festus, and Dada (2022), the integration of intellectual capital into performance evaluation frameworks emphasises the necessity of incorporating human, structural, and relational capital in the measurement of performance. Thus, the definition of organisational performance has evolved from narrow financial metrics to a more integrated, system-wide evaluation of organisational capacity, strategic alignment, and value creation.

Nevertheless, despite these converging perspectives, the concept remains contested in its scope and operationalisation. Carneiro-da-Cunha, Hourneaux Jr, and Corrêa (2016) trace the historical evolution of organisational performance measurement, noting that while earlier models prioritised financial efficiency, contemporary frameworks such as the Balanced Scorecard and the Performance Prism integrate both quantitative and qualitative indicators. This critical shift reflects an increasing awareness of the limitations inherent in traditional metrics. Malhotra et al. (2025) argue that performance must be understood as a dynamic interaction between internal competencies and external competitiveness, reinforcing the resource-based view of the firm. However, challenges persist in standardising what constitutes performance across sectors and contexts. O'Boyle (2015) notes that in the sport sector, for example, performance is as much about stakeholder

satisfaction and community engagement as it is about financial results or competitive success. Similarly, Mohammad (2014) cautions that performance measurement systems, if poorly designed, can create distortions by incentivising short-term gains over sustainable outcomes. These perspectives underscore that organisational performance is not a static or universally measurable attribute but rather a context-sensitive construct shaped by strategic intent, stakeholder expectations, and managerial interpretation.

### **2.2.2. Leadership**

Leadership is a multidimensional concept that has been defined and interpreted through various theoretical lenses, yet it continues to resist a universally accepted definition due to its complexity and context-dependency. Northouse (2025) defines leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. This definition emphasises the dynamic and relational nature of leadership, rather than viewing it solely as a personal trait or positional authority. Ulrich and Smallwood (2012) similarly conceptualise leadership as the capacity to build human capital, manage talent, and mobilise resources toward the execution of an organisation's strategic objectives. However, Summerfield (2014) challenges overly broad definitions by stating that leadership should be defined not by position or charisma, but by its ability to produce tangible results through influence and vision. While such definitional efforts converge around influence and goal attainment, Iszatt-White and Saunders (2017) argue that leadership also entails values-based guidance and behavioural integrity, thereby

broadening the construct beyond managerial control. Bolden, Gosling, and Hawkins (2023) add further complexity by highlighting that leadership is culturally mediated and historically situated, suggesting that any definition must account for socio-political contexts and evolving power relations.

The debate surrounding the definition of leadership is further complicated by the conflation of leadership with management, a distinction scholars have long attempted to clarify. Kouzes and Posner (2023) describe leadership as an art of enabling others to act, grounded in trust, shared vision, and emotional connection, rather than transactional control mechanisms. Guthrie and Devies (2024) similarly position leadership as a developmental process that involves cultivating personal authenticity and ethical responsibility. Yet, such normative definitions have been critiqued for their prescriptive nature. Anderson and Hamman (2024) argue that defining leadership through idealistic attributes overlooks the situational and contingent dimensions that often determine its effectiveness. Velarde (2023) supports this critique by underscoring that leadership effectiveness is context-bound and cannot be divorced from cultural intelligence, particularly in multicultural settings. Manu (2022) frames leadership as the ability to catalyse transformational change, yet this too has been criticised for romanticising leadership as a heroic endeavour. The plurality of definitions illustrates the inherently contested and elastic nature of leadership as a concept. As Schermuly et al. (2022) suggest, efforts to define leadership must move beyond

prescriptive typologies and engage with its psychological, relational, and systemic dimensions.

### **2.2.3 Leadership Styles**

Leadership style refers to the characteristic manner in which a leader exercises authority, motivates followers, makes decisions, and interacts with team members within a specific organisational context. Northouse (2025) defines leadership style as a leader's behavioural pattern as perceived by subordinates, which directly influences the organisational climate and employee productivity. This perspective is echoed by Alsarrani et al. (2021), who explain that leadership style reflects the combination of behaviours and strategies leaders use to manage and influence individuals toward achieving collective objectives. Leadership style is not merely a technical application of authority but a dynamic interaction between personality, situational context, and organisational culture (Guthrie and Devies, 2024). Kouzes and Posner (2023) argue that leadership style determines how leaders inspire, challenge, and enable others, suggesting it is a critical mediating factor between leadership intent and actual organisational outcomes. However, the ambiguity of the term has led to differing classifications and frameworks. For instance, Velarde (2023) stresses that leadership styles are often shaped by cultural intelligence, implying that styles are not universally applicable but rather contextually dependent.

Despite the extensive use of the term, the conceptual clarity of leadership style remains a point of contention. Schermuly et al. (2022) emphasise that the classification into styles

such as transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire can oversimplify the fluidity of leadership behaviour. This concern is supported by Rachmad (2022), who posits that effective leadership often requires flexibility and adaptability across styles. Manu (2022) defines transformational leadership style as the capacity to create a compelling vision and inspire commitment, while Dong (2023) describes transactional leadership as a rule-based, performance-contingent style focused on rewards and punishments. Ahsan and Khalid (2023) further define laissez-faire leadership style as the absence of active decision-making or involvement, often associated with low accountability. While these typologies are widely accepted, Anderson and Hamman (2024) critique them for neglecting the emotional and psychological dimensions of leadership practice. Moreover, Montano, Schleu, and Hüffmeier (2023) caution that leadership styles cannot be assessed in isolation from their impact on followers' wellbeing and mental health. Thus, leadership style should not be understood merely as a static category but as a relational and evolving construct that intersects with identity, ethics, and organisational structure.

### **2.2.3.1 Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership is a leadership style defined by a leader's capacity to inspire, motivate, and intellectually stimulate followers to transcend their immediate self-interests in pursuit of collective organisational goals. Northouse (2025) defines transformational leadership as a process in which leaders engage with followers to raise motivation and morality in both parties. This definition emphasizes the dual transformation of leaders and

followers, suggesting that effective leadership operates through mutual influence rather than hierarchical control. Manu (2022) characterises transformational leadership as a catalyst for disruption, wherein the leader envisions change and empowers followers to innovate and embrace uncertainty. Kouzes and Posner (2023) reinforce this view by stating that transformational leaders create a shared vision, model the desired behaviour, and encourage risk-taking to stimulate growth. Covey et al. (2022) add that trust and emotional resonance are foundational, arguing that transformational leadership is rooted in the leader's ability to unleash latent potential through belief in others. However, Schermuly et al. (2022) caution that while such leadership can foster psychological empowerment, it may also create dependency if not coupled with sufficient autonomy and support structures. These interpretations collectively suggest that transformational leadership is a dynamic and aspirational process driven by vision, emotional intelligence, and strategic influence.

Nevertheless, the conceptualisation of transformational leadership is not without limitations. Ladkin and Patrick (2022) critically argue that the foundational theories of transformational leadership often overlook structural inequalities, particularly race and power asymmetries, thereby limiting their applicability across diverse organisational contexts. Rolls (2024) asserts that transformational leadership must be grounded in learning-oriented environments to be truly effective, yet many organisations lack the systemic readiness to sustain such cultures. Mekonnen and Bayissa (2023) highlight that while transformational leadership improves organisational readiness for change, it

demands high levels of follower commitment, which may not always be present. Montano, Schleu, and Hüffmeier (2023) also indicate that although transformational leadership is generally linked to positive mental health outcomes, its effectiveness is mediated by contextual factors such as organisational climate and individual resilience. Furthermore, Dasmadi (2023) warns that idealising transformational leadership may obscure its potential for manipulation if used to mask authoritarian practices behind charismatic engagement. Despite its popularity and normative appeal, transformational leadership must therefore be critically examined through structural, contextual, and psychological lenses to avoid oversimplification and misapplication.

### **2.2.3.2 Transactional Leadership**

Transactional leadership is defined as a leadership style that is primarily based on structured exchanges between leaders and followers, where compliance is achieved through the application of rewards and punishments. Northouse (2025) explains that transactional leadership focuses on the exchange process between leaders and subordinates, where leaders clarify role expectations and reward performance accordingly. Dong (2023) builds on this by noting that transactional leaders establish clear performance standards and monitor deviations to ensure organisational efficiency. This perspective suggests that the style is inherently managerial and utilitarian, with a heavy emphasis on control, structure, and predictability. According to Oyelade et al. (2022), transactional leadership is built around contingent reinforcement, wherein leaders reward employees for meeting

specific targets or penalise them for underperformance. Ansari et al. (2024) argue that such a model is particularly suitable for short-term objectives, operational stability, and repetitive task execution, especially in industries where performance outcomes are measurable and time-bound. Mekonnen and Bayissa (2023) affirm that transactional leadership enhances organisational readiness for change when the tasks are clearly defined and the leader maintains tight control over processes.

Despite its operational appeal, the concept of transactional leadership has been subjected to considerable critique due to its restrictive and mechanistic orientation. Zhao and Sun (2024) point out that while transactional leadership may support productivity in highly structured environments, it tends to suppress innovation and intrinsic motivation among employees. Dong (2023) similarly warns that a rigid application of transactional practices may create a compliance-based culture that undermines creativity and adaptive thinking. Schermuly et al. (2022) also argue that transactional leadership may weaken psychological empowerment because it prioritises extrinsic rewards over personal growth and meaning in work. While Northouse (2025) acknowledges that transactional leadership is effective in maintaining organisational order and achieving routine goals, he notes that it lacks the visionary and inspirational qualities required to drive long-term development. Furthermore, Bititci (2015) stresses that such leadership may ignore the intangible aspects of performance, such as employee engagement and knowledge sharing, which are essential in knowledge-based and service-driven industries. Marr and Gray (2012) reinforce this by

suggesting that performance management in dynamic organisations demands more than transactional routines and requires alignment with strategic vision and human capital development. Therefore, while transactional leadership is instrumental in certain operational contexts, it is insufficient as a standalone model for achieving sustainable organisational growth and adaptability.

### **2.2.3.3 Laissez Faire Leadership**

Laissez-faire leadership is commonly defined as a leadership approach marked by the deliberate withdrawal of direct supervision, decision-making, and control, wherein subordinates are granted extensive autonomy to manage their responsibilities and make decisions. Northouse (2025) characterises laissez-faire leadership as a non-leadership form in which leaders abdicate their responsibilities and avoid intervening in followers' work processes. Ahsan and Khalid (2023) support this by stating that laissez-faire leaders often fail to provide guidance, delay decision-making, and show limited engagement in organisational processes. This definition reflects a leadership vacuum, where authority is minimally exercised, often under the assumption that individuals will self-regulate and produce outcomes independently. Houlihan (2021) observes that such leaders offer little feedback, accountability, or direction, which frequently leads to ambiguity in task execution. Leary and Miller (2021) extend this argument by asserting that laissez-faire leadership correlates strongly with increased burnout and absenteeism, suggesting that a lack of leadership engagement undermines both employee well-being and organisational

cohesion. While the model appears to encourage freedom and creativity, Robert and Vandenberghe (2021) argue that its absence of structure often impairs affective commitment, resulting in disoriented team dynamics and weakened interpersonal connections.

However, the laissez-faire leadership concept cannot be fully understood without a critical examination of the assumptions underpinning its theoretical appeal. Ahsan and Khalid (2023) note that while some interpret this style as an empowering practice that promotes decentralisation and employee independence, in reality, it frequently reflects leadership disengagement rather than intentional empowerment. Thanh and Quang (2022) found that laissez-faire leadership often has either a negligible or negative effect on employee engagement, as the absence of active oversight hinders the alignment of individual efforts with organisational goals. Bwambale, Mulegi, and Bulhan (2024) report that in educational settings, this leadership approach contributed to declines in academic performance, due to the lack of instructional support and clarity. Furthermore, Dharejo et al. (2021) emphasise that laissez-faire leadership weakens employee involvement and commitment because employees interpret the leader's passivity as indifference. Despite isolated instances where highly skilled teams may thrive under autonomy, Marr and Gray (2012) caution that strategic performance management requires intentional direction, measurement, and feedback, which laissez-faire leadership inherently lacks. As Bititci (2015) argues, organisational performance depends not only on decentralisation but on the leader's active

role in enabling, supporting, and evaluating progress. Consequently, laissez-faire leadership is more accurately described as a leadership deficiency than a legitimate leadership model, particularly in environments that demand structure, accountability, and strategic alignment.

#### **2.2.3.4 Autocratic Leadership**

Autocratic leadership is defined as a style in which the leader exercises absolute control over decisions, disregards subordinate input, and demands compliance without consultation. Northouse (2025) characterises autocratic leadership as highly directive and top-down in nature, where leaders assume unilateral control over decision-making processes. Shaw (2022) elaborates that this style is grounded in centralised authority and relies on rigid command structures to enforce conformity. In this model, subordinates are expected to follow orders without question, as the leader maintains dominance over strategic, operational, and interpersonal decisions (Iszatt-White & Saunders, 2017). Summerfield (2014) similarly defines autocratic leadership as a structure in which the leader issues directives and expects immediate execution, with little regard for employee feedback or innovation. This tightly controlled model is often justified by appeals to efficiency and discipline, especially in time-sensitive or hierarchical environments. However, Sharma (2022) argues that while autocratic leadership can produce short-term results in high-pressure settings, it often stifles creativity and discourages employee engagement.

The legitimacy of autocratic leadership as a sustainable leadership model is contested. Dim and Nzube (2020) note that although autocratic leadership may produce compliance, it significantly undermines organisational performance when overused, particularly by discouraging participation and demoralising staff. Olayisade and Awolusi (2021) observe that in the Nigerian oil and gas sector, autocratic leadership is prevalent but not necessarily effective, as it often correlates with diminished productivity and disengagement. Rufus, Festus, and Dada (2022) suggest that in environments requiring knowledge-based decision-making, autocratic leadership impedes intellectual capital utilisation by suppressing dialogue and collective reasoning. Sharma (2022) adds that profitability gains achieved under autocratic leadership are typically unsustainable, as the model fails to develop subordinate competencies or foster long-term commitment. Marr and Gray (2012) also highlight that strategic performance management cannot thrive under autocratic control, as it demands adaptability, learning, and open communication—qualities that are incompatible with unilateral leadership. Ultimately, while autocratic leadership may serve limited and specific contexts such as crisis management or military settings, its rigid and exclusionary structure renders it ineffective in dynamic, innovation-driven, and participatory organisational environments.

#### **2.2.3.5 Participative Leadership**

Participative leadership is characterised by a leadership approach in which decision-making is shared among leaders and subordinates, allowing for collaborative input and

mutual responsibility. Northouse (2025) defines participative leadership as a process that encourages group members to contribute to organisational decisions, fostering collective engagement and responsibility. Wang, Hou, and Li (2022) describe this style as one where leaders involve subordinates in identifying problems, generating solutions, and implementing strategies, though ultimate authority may still rest with the leader. Kouzes and Posner (2023) similarly suggest that participative leadership creates a climate of trust and inclusion by validating employee perspectives in organisational processes. Velarde (2023) notes that participative leadership is especially relevant in multicultural and diverse environments where shared authority contributes to inclusive organisational dynamics. Guthrie and Devies (2024) add that this style of leadership is built upon mutual respect and open communication, which supports team cohesion and enhances morale. Iszatt-White and Saunders (2017) argue that the participative model aligns leadership authority with democratic principles and is often positioned as an ethical alternative to hierarchical or autocratic approaches.

Despite its inclusive orientation, participative leadership is not without its limitations. Bititci (2015) contends that the involvement of multiple stakeholders in decision-making may delay urgent organisational responses and reduce operational efficiency in fast-paced environments. Malhotra et al. (2025) also caution that participative leadership can dilute strategic clarity if consensus is prioritised over decisiveness. Marr and Gray (2012) observe that while participative leadership may support employee engagement, it requires well-

defined performance indicators and effective feedback mechanisms to maintain accountability. O'Boyle (2015) warns that in sports and performance-driven environments, participative leadership may be impractical due to the need for authoritative direction. Similarly, Ng and Kee (2011) argue that intangible performance indicators, such as trust and communication, though necessary under participative leadership, are difficult to measure and manage consistently. While the model promotes inclusion and can enhance intellectual capital (Rufus, Festus, & Dada, 2022), its success is often contingent upon organisational maturity, employee competence, and the leader's ability to maintain structure amidst distributed decision-making. Hence, although participative leadership is widely praised for its collaborative ethos, it may produce counterproductive outcomes when applied without strategic boundaries or in contexts demanding high-speed execution.

## **2.3 Theoretical Review**

### **2.3.1 Path–Goal Theory of Leadership**

The Path–Goal Theory of Leadership, originally proposed by Robert J. House in 1971, is a seminal theory that conceptualises leadership as a process through which leaders influence subordinate performance, satisfaction, and motivation by clarifying the paths to goals and removing obstacles. Central to the theory is the assumption that effective leaders tailor their behaviour to the characteristics of their subordinates and the work environment, thereby enhancing the probability of goal attainment. House's theory builds on the expectancy theory of motivation, particularly Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Theory, which

posits that individuals are motivated when they believe that their effort will lead to desirable outcomes. In its formal structure, the theory may be expressed through the expectancy equation:  $\text{Motivation} = \text{Expectancy} \times \text{Instrumentality} \times \text{Valence}$ , where leaders enhance all three components by adjusting their style to meet the needs of their followers. Northouse (2025) reiterates that the four core leadership behaviours identified in this model such as directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented are situationally applied to maximise follower motivation and task performance.

The strength of the Path–Goal Theory lies in its contingency-based flexibility, which permits an adaptable understanding of leadership behaviour and its effects on organisational performance. Bititci (2015) notes that such adaptability is particularly vital in dynamic and performance-sensitive environments where rigid adherence to a singular leadership style may be detrimental. In complex organisational settings, the theory allows leaders to evaluate task demands and employee capabilities to choose the most appropriate behavioural response. For instance, in contexts where employees lack clarity or confidence, directive leadership becomes functional, while participative leadership may be ideal where employees are highly experienced and intrinsically motivated. Rufus, Festus, and Dada (2022) argue that effective leadership must be responsive to both intellectual capital and operational challenges, a perspective consistent with House’s emphasis on leader adaptability. However, as Marr and Gray (2012) explain, such flexibility requires that organisations embed strategic performance management systems capable of capturing the

impact of varied leadership interventions something that is often lacking in traditional, metrics-driven corporate cultures.

Nonetheless, several critiques of the theory have emerged, particularly concerning its empirical robustness and practical application. Malhotra et al. (2025) contend that while the theory theoretically accommodates situational variation, it may become operationally vague when leaders must simultaneously address competing subordinate needs or shifting external conditions. Furthermore, the theory assumes that leaders can accurately diagnose follower characteristics and environmental factors, yet in reality, this diagnostic precision is often limited by cognitive biases, organisational politics, or information asymmetry. Ng and Kee (2011) caution that the intangible indicators of performance such as morale, trust, and psychological safety that Path–Goal theory seeks to influence are difficult to measure and integrate into formal performance management systems. In sectors like financial services, where performance outcomes are tightly linked to standardised outputs, the leader’s ability to customise behaviours may be constrained by regulatory or procedural frameworks (Rufus et al., 2022). These limitations suggest that while Path–Goal theory provides a robust conceptual model, its practical efficacy depends on organisational structure, leader competence, and the availability of accurate feedback mechanisms.

Despite its limitations, Path–Goal Theory remains relevant for studies examining the effect of leadership style on organisational performance because of its pluralistic orientation and behavioural nuance. It permits scholars to examine the situational appropriateness of

multiple leadership styles and their influence on both individual and organisational outcomes. O’Boyle (2015) highlights that in sports and performance-oriented institutions, for example, leaders often oscillate between directive and supportive styles depending on athlete readiness and competition pressure—an application of the theory in real-world practice. Likewise, Summerfield (2014) suggests that leadership should not be defined solely by authority but by the leader’s ability to unlock potential and align it with organisational goals, a position that aligns with House’s original formulation. Ultimately, the Path–Goal Theory offers an integrative framework through which leadership styles can be evaluated not in isolation, but in interaction with subordinate characteristics and organisational context. This makes it particularly appropriate for examining complex relationships between leadership and performance across diverse sectors, especially in environments where organisational competitiveness, strategic flexibility, and employee engagement are essential (Malhotra et al., 2025; Guthrie & Devies, 2024).

### **2.3.2 Fiedler’s Contingency Theory**

Fiedler’s Contingency Theory of Leadership, developed by Fred E. Fiedler in the 1960s, stands as one of the earliest and most influential models to systematically link leadership effectiveness to situational variables. Unlike universal theories that prescribe specific traits or behaviours as ideal, Fiedler’s approach asserts that leadership effectiveness is contingent upon the alignment between a leader’s inherent style and the favourableness of the contextual environment. The theory introduces the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scale,

a psychometric tool used to determine whether a leader is task-oriented (low LPC score) or relationship-oriented (high LPC score). Three critical situational factors including leader-member relations, task structure, and position power interact to define the situational favourableness. The model posits that task-oriented leaders perform best in very favourable or very unfavourable situations, while relationship-oriented leaders excel in moderately favourable contexts (Northouse, 2025). This approach is foundational because it rejects the "one-best-style" assumption, which is particularly critical in studies examining the effects of varying leadership styles on organisational performance across different operational contexts.

The contingency framework finds significant relevance in empirical studies from various sectors. For instance, Dim and Nzube (2020), applying Fiedler's theory to manufacturing firms in Anambra State, found that different leadership styles autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, and transformational had divergent impacts on organisational performance, depending on the context. This supports the theory's assertion that no leadership style is universally superior. Moreover, their use of multiple regression analysis confirmed statistically significant relationships between leadership style and performance, aligning with Fiedler's theoretical predictions. Similarly, Alade (2022) found that democratic leadership styles significantly improved organisational outcomes in Nigerian firms, particularly where leader-subordinate relationships were strong, and tasks were moderately structured—conditions under which Fiedler predicts relationship-oriented leadership

would be most effective. In contrast, autocratic leadership was less effective where positional power was high but leader-member trust was lacking, further reinforcing the need for contextual alignment in leadership application.

Despite its strengths, Fiedler's model has faced criticism for its rigidity in assuming that a leader's style is fixed and cannot adapt to different situations. This inflexibility poses limitations in modern organisational environments, where leaders are often required to shift their style in response to rapidly changing variables (Iszatt-White & Saunders, 2017). Scholars such as Marr and Gray (2012) have argued that strategic performance management increasingly requires dynamic leadership that integrates both task and relational competencies. In high-performance settings, especially where innovation and agility are critical as shown in Malhotra et al. (2025) leaders who can modify their behaviour in response to evolving internal and external pressures are more likely to sustain competitive advantage. Additionally, the LPC scale, although seminal, has been criticised for its subjectivity and interpretive ambiguity. Nonetheless, the theory's core logic that leadership effectiveness is not solely a function of the leader but also of situational variables remains instrumental in understanding performance disparities across organisations, particularly in heterogeneous environments like those in sub-Saharan Africa (Rufus et al., 2022).

In practical terms, Fiedler's Contingency Theory underscores the importance of leader-situation matching in optimising organisational performance. Organisations aiming to

improve performance outcomes should focus not only on leadership development but also on role placement and structural alignment. For instance, Bititci (2015) argues that effective performance management systems must accommodate leadership-situation fit by deploying leaders in contexts where their natural style can thrive. This approach is supported by empirical findings from studies such as Dele et al. (2015), which highlight how different leadership styles can have varied implications for performance in the Nigerian banking sector depending on structural and relational variables. Furthermore, in resource-constrained environments, such as SMEs in Nigeria, the theory provides a practical lens for selecting or developing leaders whose styles align with organisational maturity, stakeholder expectations, and operational volatility (Lawal et al., 2014). As leadership continues to be a determinant of organisational success, Fiedler's theory offers a robust, albeit sometimes rigid, framework through which researchers and practitioners can assess and optimise the interplay between leadership style and contextual dynamics in driving organisational performance.

### **2.3.3. Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) Theory**

Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, originally developed by Dansereau, Graen, and Haga in the 1970s, and later refined by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), represents a foundational shift from traditional leadership models that treated leader–follower relationships as homogeneous. Instead, LMX Theory posits that leaders do not relate to all subordinates uniformly; rather, they develop distinct relationships of varying quality with

individual members. These relationships fall into two broad categories: high-quality exchanges characterised by trust, mutual respect, and obligation; and low-quality exchanges marked by formality, limited trust, and transactional engagement. The quality of the dyadic exchange is understood to influence various organisational outcomes, particularly performance, job satisfaction, and commitment. Unlike prescriptive models that advocate a singular style of leadership, LMX Theory centres the leadership process within the interpersonal dynamics between leaders and individual members, making it particularly useful in examining how leadership, in its differentiated forms, can shape organisational performance (Northouse, 2025; Iszatt-White & Saunders, 2017).

The theoretical relevance of LMX to organisational performance is increasingly supported by empirical findings. Ng and Kee (2011) emphasise that the intangible assets of organisations such as trust, engagement, and intellectual capital are often embedded in the quality of interpersonal relationships, rather than formalised structures. This is especially salient in studies like Rufus, Festus, and Dada (2022), which link intellectual capital to performance in Nigeria's financial sector. Their findings suggest that organisations thrive when leaders develop relational depth with key personnel, affirming the LMX proposition that high-quality dyadic exchanges yield performance-enhancing trust and psychological empowerment. Similarly, Robert and Vandenberghe (2021) found that high-quality leader–member exchanges increase affective commitment, particularly when subordinate self-concept aligns with relational leadership practices. In highly dynamic sectors like banking,

as explored by Dele et al. (2015), where transactional efficiency and responsiveness are paramount, LMX enables performance optimisation by allowing leaders to prioritise support for high-performing subordinates without necessarily standardising interactions across the workforce. This relational stratification, though potentially inequitable, can become a strategic asset if ethically managed.

However, LMX Theory is not without its limitations. The core criticism lies in its potential to institutionalise in-group/out-group dynamics, wherein certain employees receive preferential treatment, resources, and developmental opportunities, potentially engendering perceptions of bias and organisational injustice. This becomes problematic in contexts where equity and fairness are central to performance culture, particularly in the public sector or regulated environments. Schermuly et al. (2022), in a meta-analysis, caution that while high LMX correlates with empowerment, the inverse low LMX can exacerbate disengagement and reduce morale. Moreover, Marr and Gray (2012) note that performance management systems in many organisations remain poorly equipped to measure or moderate the nuanced impacts of relational leadership, particularly those arising from informal dyads. In highly structured organisations, the operationalisation of LMX may be difficult, as systemic hierarchies and procedural rigidity limit the leader's ability to personalise interactions. Nonetheless, if used conscientiously, LMX can help leaders create pockets of excellence within departments that serve as catalysts for broader

organisational transformation, as observed in Olayisade and Awolusi's (2021) analysis of leadership practices in the Nigerian oil and gas sector.

Despite these criticisms, LMX Theory remains an empirically grounded and adaptable model for examining the effect of leadership on organisational performance. Its conceptual flexibility makes it particularly suitable in heterogeneous organisational contexts such as those documented by Alade (2022) and Ajeigbe et al. (2021), where leadership effectiveness varies significantly depending on interpersonal rapport and cultural expectations. In sport and education sectors, for instance, O'Boyle (2015) and Parveen et al. (2022) demonstrate how high-quality leader-member interactions foster trust and individual motivation, leading to improved performance outcomes. Moreover, as Bititci (2015) asserts, managing business performance increasingly requires an understanding of not only structural metrics but also relational dynamics that affect information flow and decision-making. The use of LMX principles allows for such nuanced engagement. In practice, organisations can leverage LMX by training leaders to recognise and develop personalised, trust-based relationships while also establishing organisational safeguards to prevent perceptions of inequity. This dual approach enables the benefits of relational leadership while mitigating its risks, thereby positioning LMX Theory as a valuable lens for both academic inquiry and strategic performance management in diverse organisational settings.

## **2.4 Empirical Review**

Afolabi (2023) undertook a cross-sectional study to evaluate the impact of autocratic, transformational, and transactional leadership styles on employee performance in a Nigerian tertiary healthcare institution. Data were obtained from 110 respondents (comprising both non-management and management staff) using a 30-item validated questionnaire. Analysed via SPSS version 26, the findings indicated that transformational leadership had the most significant positive effect on employee performance, followed by transactional leadership. In contrast, autocratic leadership negatively influenced performance outcomes. The study provides evidence that leadership styles centred on vision, motivation, and shared goals are better suited for complex, people-centred environments like healthcare. These findings reinforce the prevailing academic consensus that transformational leadership, which focuses on inspiration and development, is most conducive to optimal organisational performance in knowledge-intensive sectors.

The study conducted by Alade (2022) investigates the influence of leadership styles specifically democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire on organisational behaviour and performance within selected Nigerian organisations. Employing a survey research design, primary data were gathered through structured questionnaires and analysed using SPSS. The study reports a strong internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.8), enhancing the reliability of its findings. The results indicate that among the three leadership styles examined, democratic leadership had the most substantial positive effect on organisational

performance and employee productivity. In contrast, autocratic and laissez-faire styles were less effective, highlighting the value of participatory decision-making in enhancing quality of work life.

Parveen et al. (2022) conducted an empirical investigation into the impact of principal leadership styles such as autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire on teacher job performance in public secondary schools in Faisalabad, Pakistan. The study utilised a correlational research design and collected data from 102 principals and 512 teachers using validated instruments, each showing strong internal consistency ( $\alpha > 0.75$ ). The results of multiple regression and Pearson correlation analysis revealed that 59.3% of the variance in teacher job performance was explained by the leadership styles adopted by principals. Autocratic leadership emerged as the most widely used and significantly contributed to improved teacher performance, whereas laissez-faire leadership was largely ineffective or detrimental. The findings underscore the need for balanced application of leadership styles, suggesting that while firm control can yield positive results in performance, over-reliance on non-interventionist approaches may hinder instructional effectiveness. This context-sensitive insight affirms that leadership in educational settings must align with institutional demands and teacher expectations.

Olayisade and Awolusi (2021) provide an empirical examination of how various leadership styles influence employee productivity in Nigeria's oil and gas sector, using Chevron Nigeria Limited as a case study. Data were collected from 125 employees using a five-

point Likert scale questionnaire encompassing autocratic, democratic, bureaucratic, laissez-faire, transactional, and charismatic leadership styles. Of the distributed questionnaires, 93 valid responses were analysed using SPSS for both descriptive and inferential statistics, including regression analysis. The findings reveal that autocratic leadership is the most predominant in the studied organisation, followed by laissez-faire and bureaucratic styles, with democratic and charismatic leadership styles being less prevalent. Despite the dominance of autocratic leadership, the study affirms that all examined styles have significant effects on employee productivity, albeit to varying degrees. This suggests the coexistence and interplay of multiple leadership styles in high-stakes environments like oil and gas, where productivity is closely linked to strategic execution and organisational culture.

The study by Nurani et al. (2021) examines the effects of leadership style on organisational commitment and employee performance within an Indonesian university context, using structural equation modelling (SEM) with Smart PLS. The researchers collected data from 95 respondents who held structural positions through a census sampling technique. The model tested three key pathways: the direct effect of leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment; the combined effect of leadership style, satisfaction, and commitment on performance; and the mediating role of job satisfaction and commitment between leadership and performance. Findings demonstrate that leadership style positively and significantly impacts job satisfaction and organisational commitment, which in turn

influence employee performance. Importantly, the indirect effects where leadership operates through mediating variables are stronger than direct effects. This indicates that effective leadership improves organisational performance not merely by directing tasks, but by fostering environments that promote psychological ownership and organisational loyalty.

The study by Ajeigbe, Owolabi, and Alasinrin (2021) explores the relationship between leadership styles of sports administrators and organisational performance within the Kwara State Sports Council in Nigeria. Using a descriptive survey design of a correlational type, data were collected from 62 respondents comprising coaches, directors, and managers using a modified four-point Likert scale questionnaire. The instrument's reliability was established with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.80. Multiple regression analysis was employed to test the null hypotheses at a 0.05 level of significance. The findings reveal that leadership styles significantly correlate with and contribute to organisational performance. Each style whether democratic, autocratic, or laissez-faire had a statistically significant effect on organisational outcomes, suggesting that sports administrators benefit from applying a diverse leadership repertoire.

Abubakar and Ahmed (2021) investigated the effect of transformational leadership on the performance of universities in Nigeria. Using a census approach and structured questionnaires, the authors applied Partial Least Squares (PLS) and bootstrapping techniques to analyse the data. The study found a statistically significant positive

relationship between transformational leadership and university performance. This finding suggests that transformational leadership practices—such as vision casting, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration—play a critical role in driving institutional excellence within higher education. Given the performance deficits facing Nigerian universities, the study highlights the need for leadership reforms that embrace transformation, strategic vision, and staff development to enhance global competitiveness. In the study by Dim and Nzube (2020), the authors explored the impact of various leadership styles on organisational performance in six foam manufacturing firms in Anambra State, Nigeria. Employing Fiedler’s Contingency Theory as the theoretical foundation, the researchers used descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation alongside multiple regression analysis on a sample of 321 employees. The results indicated that autocratic leadership had a significant negative effect on performance, while democratic, laissez-faire, and transformational leadership styles each had a significant positive influence. These findings demonstrate the contextual sensitivity of leadership effectiveness and reinforce the argument that participatory and empowering leadership practices are more beneficial for manufacturing firms aiming to improve organisational performance in dynamic environments.

The study by Shafiu, Manaf, and Muslim (2019) explores the impact of leadership on organisational performance, with a specific focus on academic institutions in Nigeria. Using a quantitative survey design, the authors collected data through questionnaires

administered to 350 academic staff members across 12 faculties, of which 300 valid responses were returned. The data were analysed using correlation analysis, which revealed that leadership style significantly influenced the timely achievement of organisational goals by academic staff. However, the study also found that the leadership approaches in place were not facilitating the potential of academic staff to exceed their performance expectations. This suggests that while leadership contributes to meeting basic institutional goals, it may simultaneously hinder the cultivation of innovation and discretionary performance. The study underscores the importance of leadership practices that balance directive oversight with empowerment to fully optimise organisational outcomes in higher education.

Ibrahim and Daniel (2019) conducted a study to assess the effect of leadership on organisational performance within Coca-Cola Nigeria, located in Abuja. The study used Yamane's formula to determine a representative sample of 250 from a population of 505 employees, out of which 200 responses were successfully retrieved. Their analysis confirmed a statistically significant relationship between leadership style and employee performance. Notably, participatory leadership and effective delegation were found to directly enhance employee performance and facilitate the achievement of organisational goals. This aligns with broader literature suggesting that inclusive leadership fosters better employee engagement and productivity. The study concludes that leadership style is a

critical determinant of organisational effectiveness and advocates for adaptive and empowering leadership approaches in corporate settings.

Akparep, Jengre, and Mogre (2019) conducted a qualitative case study to examine the influence of leadership style on organisational performance at TumaKavi Development Association (TKDA) in Ghana's Northern Region. Using purposive sampling, the study gathered data from 11 respondents, representing 65% of the total staff population. The findings reveal that TKDA predominantly applies a democratic leadership style, which was found to significantly enhance the organisation's performance. The study underscores the role of participatory governance in fostering operational efficiency and staff engagement, particularly in development-oriented organisations. The results further affirm the broader argument in leadership literature that democratic leadership characterised by inclusiveness, dialogue, and collaborative decision-making promotes higher organisational effectiveness, particularly in non-profit and community-based sectors where stakeholder buy-in is essential for success.

Olajide and Okunbanjo (2018) examined the interplay among leadership styles, employee empowerment, and organisational performance within the Nigerian banking industry. Focusing on selected branches of United Bank for Africa (UBA) in Lagos, the study administered 342 questionnaires, of which 186 were usable for analysis. Employing regression and Pearson correlation analyses, the study found that directive leadership style and staff training positively influenced employee performance. Interestingly, participative

leadership showed no significant correlation with employee turnover, while delegation of authority was found to be significantly linked to turnover rates. These findings suggest that while directive leadership fosters immediate performance gains, it may not necessarily translate to long-term staff retention unless complemented by participatory structures. The study highlights the need for banking institutions to develop leadership strategies that balance control with empowerment to optimise both performance and employee retention. Yusuf-Habeeb and Ibrahim (2017) examined the effects of leadership styles on employee performance in Nigerian universities amidst prevailing challenges such as poor global rankings and systemic inefficiencies. Drawing on primary data collected from 388 university employees via structured questionnaires, the study employed statistical techniques using SPSS to analyse the relationship between leadership styles and institutional performance. The findings reveal that the leadership styles adopted within Nigerian universities significantly shape their organisational outcomes, particularly in terms of staff performance. However, the study noted that the prevalent leadership models in these institutions were contributing to, rather than alleviating, existing inefficiencies. This implies a misalignment between leadership practices and performance expectations, thereby calling for more participatory and performance-driven leadership strategies in Nigerian higher education.

Ajibade, Ajayi, and Shobowale (2017) investigated the relationship between leadership style and employee performance at the Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro in Ogun State, Nigeria.

Using both primary and secondary data sources, the study assessed the extent to which leadership practices influence service delivery and employee outcomes in the public tertiary education sector. The research found that the leadership styles adopted by institutional leaders had a measurable but moderate effect on employee performance. A key observation was that employees tended to apply leadership concepts in their own work, suggesting an embedded culture of leadership diffusion. While not statistically detailed, the study implies that decentralised leadership practices and consistent application of leadership principles across departments contribute incrementally to performance improvements. This supports the notion that leadership's impact in educational institutions is both cultural and behavioural, shaped by the institutional ethos and internal norms.

The study conducted by Kabir, Okuboyejo, Ilori, and Adeogun (2016) offers a qualitative exploration of how organisational leadership influences performance within Nigeria's service sector. Drawing on both primary and secondary data sources, the researchers employed in-depth interviews with 21 managerial-level employees at MM Sheriff Nigeria Ltd., alongside thematic analysis of existing empirical literature. Through content analysis, the study identified several leadership-linked drivers of organisational performance, including value creation, profitability, innovation, shareholder returns, and market expansion. The findings suggest that leadership is not a standalone factor but operates synergistically with other organisational attributes to enhance overall performance. The

study underscores the importance of contextualised leadership practices that are strategically aligned with sector-specific objectives.

Dele, Adegboyega, and Taiwo (2015) conducted an empirical investigation into the effects of leadership styles on organisational performance in the Nigerian banking sector, specifically in Ado Ekiti. Survey data were collected from 450 randomly selected respondents and analysed using SPSS. The study employed Cronbach's alpha to confirm the reliability of the constructs and used principal component analysis for validity testing. Regression analysis revealed that both transformational ( $B = 0.336$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and transactional ( $B = 0.306$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) leadership styles had significant positive effects on organisational performance. This suggests that while transformational leadership inspires innovation and strategic growth, transactional leadership remains essential for managing daily operations and ensuring compliance. The findings advocate for a hybrid approach where banks integrate both styles to achieve superior organisational outcomes.

Saasongu (2015) provides a focused analysis on the impact of leadership styles on organisational performance within small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) in Makurdi, Nigeria. Using Friedman's Chi-Square test and SPSS, the study evaluated responses from 70 employees across three firms. It specifically examined the differential impacts of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee performance. The findings reveal that while transformational leadership had a positive but statistically insignificant effect on performance, transactional leadership produced a significant

positive impact. Based on these findings, the study recommends that SMEs adopt transactional leadership in their early stages, where clarity, structure, and extrinsic rewards are paramount, but gradually shift towards transformational practices as the business matures. The implication is that the effectiveness of leadership style is phase-dependent, and successful organisations must calibrate their leadership approach to their growth trajectory and workforce development needs.

Lawal, Ajonbadi, and Otokiti (2014) provide an empirical investigation into the relationship between leadership styles and organisational effectiveness among Nigerian SMEs. The study surveyed 268 SMEs using descriptive and inferential statistics to analyse the data collected. A key finding was that Nigerian SMEs typically exhibit autocratic leadership styles, characterised by wide power distances between business owners and employees. However, this dominant leadership approach was found to have an insignificant effect on organisational effectiveness. This suggests that autocratic styles, while prevalent, may not support the dynamic and participatory culture needed for enhanced performance in SMEs. The authors conclude that for SMEs to thrive in Nigeria's evolving business environment, there must be a paradigm shift towards more participatory and collaborative leadership models.

**Table 2.1: Summary of Empirical Studies on Leadership Styles and Organisational Performance**

S/No	Author(s)	Year	Topic	Location	Methodology	Key Findings
1	Afolabi, A. R.	2023	Impact of leadership styles on employee performance	Nigeria (Healthcare sector)	Cross-sectional survey using 30-item questionnaire; SPSS 26 analysis	Transformational leadership had the most significant positive impact; transactional also positive; autocratic had negative effect on employee performance.
2	Alade, A. O.	2022	Effects of leadership styles on organisational behaviour and performance	Nigeria (Selected organisations)	Survey using structured questionnaire; SPSS; Cronbach alpha = 0.8	Democratic leadership had the strongest positive impact on organisational performance compared to autocratic and laissez-faire styles.
3	Parveen, K. et al.	2022	Principal leadership styles and teacher job performance	Pakistan (Faisalabad, public schools)	Correlational design; 102 principals & 512 teachers; multiple regression, Pearson's correlation	Autocratic leadership most common and positively impacted teacher performance; laissez-faire was unhelpful; mixed approach recommended.
4	Abubakar, A., & Ahmed, S.	2021	Transformational leadership and university performance	Nigeria (University sector)	Structured questionnaire; PLS and bootstrap analysis	Transformational leadership significantly improved university performance; recommendation for continued use in

						higher education settings.
5	Olayisade, A., & Awolusi, O. D.	2021	Leadership styles and employee productivity	Nigeria (Oil & Gas industry – Chevron)	Questionnaire (93 valid); SPSS; descriptive & regression analyses	Autocratic leadership was predominant; all styles significantly influenced productivity with varying effects; multiple styles co-exist in practice.
6	Nurani, D. W., Samdin, S., Nasrul, N., & Sukotjo, E.	2021	Leadership style, job satisfaction, and performance	Indonesia (University staff)	Census of 95 staff; SEM with Smart PLS 2	Leadership style positively affects job satisfaction and commitment; indirect influence on performance (via satisfaction/commitment) stronger than direct.
7	Ajeigbe, I. Y., Owolabi, A. Y., & Alasinrin, S.	2021	Leadership styles and organisational development	Nigeria (Ilorin, Sports Council)	Correlational survey; 62 sports personnel; Likert-scale questionnaire; regression	All leadership styles significantly influenced organisational performance; flexible leadership style adoption recommended.
8	Dim, E., & Nzube, C. A.	2020	Leadership styles and performance in foam manufacturing firms	Nigeria (Anambra State)	Survey of 321 from 6 firms; regression and Pearson correlation	Democratic, transformational, and laissez-faire styles had positive effects; autocratic style had negative effect on performance.

9	Akparep, J. Y., Jengre, E., & Mogre, A. A.	2019	Leadership styles and performance at a development association	Ghana (Tamale – TKDA)	Qualitative case study; 11 respondents; purposive sampling	Democratic leadership style led to improved organisational performance; strong positive relationship between leadership and performance.
10	Ibrahim, A. U., & Daniel, C. O.	2019	Leadership and performance in Coca-Cola	Nigeria (Abuja)	Survey of 250; SPSS analysis	Participatory leadership and delegation positively impacted performance; leadership style directly affects goal achievement.
11	Shafiu, A. M., Manaf, H. A., & Muslim, S.	2019	Organisational leadership and performance	Nigeria (University academic staff)	Survey of 350 academic staff; correlation analysis	Leadership style influenced goal achievement but did not encourage exceeding targets; limited motivational effect.
12	Olajide, O. T., & Okunbanjo, O. I.	2018	Leadership, empowerment, and performance in banking	Nigeria (UBA – Lagos)	342 questionnaires; 186 usable; SPSS, regression & correlation	Directive leadership and training enhanced performance; delegation influenced turnover; participative leadership had no effect on turnover.
13	Ajibade, O. E., Ajayi, T. O., & Shobowale, O.	2017	Leadership style and employee performance in polytechnic	Nigeria (Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro)	Mixed methods; primary and secondary data;	Leadership moderately influenced service delivery; employee-level leadership behaviours

					descriptive analysis	contributed to performance.
14	Yusuf-Habeeb, M., & Ibrahim, Y.	2017	Leadership style and employee performance in universities	Nigeria (Universities)	Questionnaire (388); SPSS analysis; literature review	Leadership styles significantly affected university performance; poor leadership aggravated institutional challenges.
15	Kabir, A. A., Okuboyejo, S., Ilori, G. E., & Adeogun, O. S.	2016	Organisational leadership in the service sector	Nigeria (MM Sheriff Ltd., Maiduguri)	Qualitative (interviews with 21 key personnel); thematic content analysis	Performance driven by leadership in synergy with value creation, profitability, innovation, and shareholder return.
16	Dele, A. O., Adegboye, O. I., & Taiwo, A. K.	2015	Leadership styles and bank performance	Nigeria (Ado-Ekiti – Banking sector)	Survey of 450; SPSS; Principal Component Analysis; regression	Transactional and transformational leadership styles positively impacted performance (B=0.306 & 0.336, respectively).
17	Saasongu, N.	2015	Leadership style in SMEs	Nigeria (Makurdi, SMEs)	Survey of 70 employees; SPSS; Friedman's Chi-square	Transactional style had significant positive effect; transformational was positive but insignificant; recommended transition to transformational as firms mature.
18	Lawal, A. A., Ajonbadi, H. A., &	2014	Leadership and performance in SMEs	Nigeria (National – SME sector)	Survey of 268 SMEs; descriptive and	Autocratic leadership dominant; no significant

	Otokiti, B. O.				inferential statistics	relationship found between leadership style and performance due to high power distance.
--	-------------------	--	--	--	---------------------------	---

Author's Compilation (2025)

## 2.5 Gaps in Literature

Despite a growing body of research on the influence of leadership styles on organisational performance, the empirical findings remain mixed and inconclusive. Several studies have reported positive and significant relationships between leadership styles especially transformational, democratic, and transactional and organisational or employee performance. For instance, Afolabi (2023) found that both transformational and transactional leadership styles positively impacted employee performance in a Nigerian healthcare institution. Similarly, Alade (2022) and Nurani et al. (2021) concluded that democratic and transformational leadership styles contributed significantly to enhanced organisational behaviour and employee outcomes. Dim and Nzube (2020) further confirmed the positive effect of democratic, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership styles on firm performance. However, contrasting evidence exists. For example, Saasongu (2015) found transformational leadership to have an insignificant effect on employee performance in SMEs, whereas Lawal et al. (2014) reported no significant relationship between leadership styles and organisational effectiveness in Nigerian SMEs due to high power distance. Likewise, Shafiu et al. (2019) observed that leadership did not necessarily

encourage academic staff to exceed expectations, even though it supported timely task completion. These inconsistent outcomes highlight a persistent gap in the literature, suggesting that context, sector, and variables adopted may moderate these relationships. This inconsistency underscores the need for further empirical studies to clarify these contradictions, particularly by considering multiple leadership styles within a uniform model.

In examining the effect of leadership styles, scholars have employed various combinations of leadership variables, further complicating comparative analysis across studies. For instance, Olayisade and Awolusi (2021) investigated seven styles autocratic, democratic, bureaucratic, laissez-faire, transactional, charismatic, and transformational, while Nurani et al. (2021) focused on job satisfaction and organisational commitment as mediators. Kabir et al. (2016) examined value creation and innovation as outcomes, while Ibrahim and Daniel (2019) assessed participatory leadership and delegation of duties. Parveen et al. (2022) concentrated on three leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire) in relation to teacher job performance, and Dele et al. (2015) limited their model to transactional and transformational leadership. Ajibade et al. (2017) focused broadly on leadership and performance without clearly distinguishing between styles. While the broad scope of leadership constructs enriches understanding, the lack of a standardised framework limits the generalisability of findings. Hence, this study will adopt a unified set of five commonly used leadership style variables such as transformational, transactional,

autocratic, participative, and laissez-faire to provide a clearer, comparative perspective on how leadership style influences organisational performance.

Moreover, a review of the literature reveals that existing studies have concentrated predominantly on specific sectors and geographical contexts, often neglecting others. For instance, studies have focused on the oil and gas sector (Olayisade & Awolusi, 2021), university education (Yusuf-Habeeb & Ibrahim, 2017; Abubakar & Ahmed, 2021), public secondary schools (Parveen et al., 2022), healthcare (Afolabi, 2023), sports administration (Ajeigbe et al., 2021), foam manufacturing (Dim & Nzube, 2020), SMEs (Lawal et al., 2014; Saasongu, 2015), development associations (Akpapere et al., 2019), banking (Olajide & Okunbanjo, 2018), and academic institutions (Shafiu et al., 2019). While these studies contribute to contextual understanding, there is a notable lack of empirical focus on the hospitality industry, particularly hotels, in the context of Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. This geographic and sectoral underrepresentation presents a significant gap. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City, an area that remains underexplored in current academic discourse. Addressing this gap will not only contribute to balancing the contextual distribution of leadership research but also provide fresh empirical evidence from a distinct urban and commercial environment in Nigeria.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This section outlines the methods and procedures adopted for the study, including an overview of the study area, the target population, the research design, the process of determining the sample size, the tools used for data collection, the validity assessment of the instrument, the data collection approach, the techniques employed for data analysis, and the operationalisation of variables.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

In this study, a descriptive research methodology was adopted due to its suitability for examining the characteristics of a specific population and testing hypotheses. This approach was chosen because it ensures objectivity and does not permit the researcher to manipulate the variables under investigation (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

#### **3.3 Population of the Study**

The population of this study will comprise of employees of selected hotels in Benin City, Edo state. The selected hotels include Protea Hotel, Precious Palm Royal Hotel, Uyi Grand Hotel, Western Villa Hotel, Limoh Suites and El-Hassani hotel. The justification of the selection of these hotels was as a result of their large employment base and the proximity of their location to the researcher. The population of employees in these hotels as retrieved

by the researcher from management of the selected hotels is two hundred and two (202).

The breakdown of the population is presented in the table below:

**Table 3.1: Population Distribution of the Study**

<b>S/NO</b>	<b>Hotel</b>	<b>Number of Employees</b>
1	Protea Hotel	35
2	Precious Palm Royal Hotel	28
3	Uyi Grand Hotel	39
4	Western Villa Hotel	56
5	Limoh Suites	25
6	El-Hassani Hotel	19
<b>Total number of Employees</b>		<b>202</b>

**Source: Management of Hotels (2025)**

### 3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Technique

To get a sample size effective and efficient for the research study, the sample size determination formula by Taro Yammane (1967) will be used in determining the sample size:

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

In the formular above;

n is the required sample size from the population understudy

N is the whole population that is understudy

e is the precision or sampling error which is usually 0.05 for management sciences

Therefore;

$$n = \frac{202}{1 + 202(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{202}{1 + 202(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{3637}{1 + 0.505}$$

$$n = \frac{202}{1.505}$$

$n=134$  (Rounded)

However, to get the exact number of questionnaires to be distributed to employees of the various hotels, the following formula will be adopted:

$$\text{Hotel} = \frac{P}{N} \times \frac{n}{1}$$

**Where;**

P = Departmental Population

N= total population

n= sample size

Therefore

$$\text{Protea Hotel} = \frac{35}{202} \times \frac{134}{1} = \underline{\underline{23}}$$

$$\text{Precious Palm Royal Hotel} = \frac{28}{202} \times \frac{134}{1} = \underline{\underline{19}}$$

$$\text{Uyi Grand Hotel} = \frac{39}{202} \times \frac{134}{1} = \underline{\underline{26}}$$

$$\text{Western Villa Hotel} = \frac{56}{202} \times \frac{134}{1} = \underline{\underline{37}}$$

$$\text{Limoh Suites} = \frac{25}{202} \times \frac{134}{1} = \underline{\underline{17}}$$

$$\text{El-Hassani Hotel} = \frac{19}{202} \times \frac{134}{1} = \underline{12}$$

The selected Hotels distribution of the sample size is presented in the table below:

**Table 3.2: Sample Distribution of the Study**

S/NO	Hotel	Number of Employees	Sample Size
1	Protea Hotel	35	23
2	Precious Palm Royal Hotel	28	19
3	Uyi Grand Hotel	39	26
4	Western Villa Hotel	56	37
5	Limoh Suites	25	17
6	El-Hassani Hotel	19	12
<b>Total number of Employees</b>		<b>202</b>	<b>134</b>

**Source: Author's Computation (2025)**

The study employed a random probability sampling technique, ensuring that every member of the population within the study area had an equal chance of being selected, as they share homogeneous characteristics. Consequently, samples were selected from the population using this random sampling approach.

### **3.5 Operationalization and Measurement of variables**

The objective of this study is to examine the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance in selected hotels in Benin City, Edo State. In this context, the dependent variable is Organisational Performance (OP), while the independent variables consist of five leadership styles: Transformational Leadership (TFL), Transactional Leadership (TSL), Laissez-faire Leadership (LFL), Autocratic Leadership (ATL), and Participative Leadership (PTL). These variables are operationalised to capture specific leadership behaviours and their potential influence on organisational performance, which encompasses the efficiency, effectiveness, and overall functioning of the hotels. Responses will be measured using a structured questionnaire on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The operational definitions and corresponding questionnaire items are presented in Table 3.3.

**Table 3.3: Operationalization and Measurement of Variables**

S/N	Variable	Type	Operationalisation	Measurement Scale	Question Number(s)
<b>Personal Data</b>					
1	Gender	Demographic Variable	Biological sex of the respondent	Nominal	Q1
2	Age	Demographic Variable	Age group of the respondent	Ordinal	Q2
3	Educational Qualification	Demographic Variable	Highest level of formal education attained	Ordinal	Q3
4	Employment Position	Demographic Variable	Role occupied by the respondent in the hotel	Nominal	Q4
5	Years of Experience	Demographic Variable	Number of years the respondent has worked in the hotel industry	Ordinal	Q5
<b>Independent Variables (Leadership Styles)</b>					
6	Transformational Leadership (TFL)	Independent Variable	Leader's ability to inspire, motivate, and foster innovation and vision	5-point Likert-type scale	Q6 – Q10
7	Transactional Leadership (TSL)	Independent Variable	Leadership based on rewards, punishments, and formal exchanges	5-point Likert-type scale	Q11 – Q15
8	Laissez-faire Leadership (LFL)	Independent Variable	Leadership characterised by non-intervention or minimal direction	5-point Likert-type scale	Q16 – Q20

9	Autocratic Leadership (ATL)	Independent Variable	Leadership involving unilateral decision-making and high control	5-point Likert-type scale	Q21 – Q25
10	Participative Leadership (PTL)	Independent Variable	Leadership that encourages employee involvement in decision-making	5-point Likert-type scale	Q26 – Q30
<b>Dependent Variable</b>					
11	Organisational Performance (OP)	Dependent Variable	The effectiveness and efficiency of the hotel in achieving its strategic goals	5-point Likert-type scale	Q31 – Q35

*Source: Author's Compilation (2025)*

### **3.6 Data Collection Instrument**

The data collection instrument will be a questionnaire. The survey questions were developed by the researcher to align with the study's objectives. The questionnaire will be divided into sections, including socio-demographic information, questions addressing the dependent variable (Workers' Productivity), and questions focused on the independent variables (autocratic management style, democratic management style, laissez-faire management style, and transformational management style).

#### **3.6.1 Validity of the Research Instrument**

The validity of the questionnaire used in this study was established through a thorough validation process, which was done by the supervisor. The supervisor's feedback,

professional recommendations, and evaluative comments were instrumental in refining and finalizing the research instrument.

### 3.6.2 Reliability of the research instrument

The reliability of the research instrument in this study was evaluated using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, a statistical measure that indicates the internal consistency of a set of items within a questionnaire essentially assessing how well the items collectively measure the same underlying construct (Sekaran, 2003). The reliability of the questions will be tested using the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient, with a benchmark score of 0.70.

### **3.7 Method of Data Collection**

The primary method of data collection for this study is a structured questionnaire, which will be administered physically to employees across the six selected hotels in Benin City. The distribution of the questionnaire will be proportionate to the number of employees in each hotel, as shown in Table 3.2, to ensure fair representation. A total of 134 questionnaires will be distributed, with 23 allocated to Protea Hotel, 19 to Precious Palm Royal Hotel, 26 to Uyi Grand Hotel, 37 to Western Villa Hotel, 17 to Limoh Suites, and 12 to El-Hassani Hotel. The researcher will personally visit each hotel to distribute and retrieve the questionnaires, in coordination with the human resource departments, to facilitate access to respondents and ensure a high response rate. This approach is intended

to enhance the reliability of the data and allow for clarification of any ambiguities in the questionnaire during administration.

### **3.8 Method of Data Analysis**

The data analysis for this study will be conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The researcher will ensure that the returned questionnaires are properly completed. The data will be classified for accuracy and analyzed. Results will be presented using frequency distribution tables to address the research questions, with a minimum acceptable mean of 2.5. Furthermore, the study's hypotheses will be tested using the regression analysis technique, where a p-value greater than 0.05 ( $p > 0.05$ ) indicates acceptance of the null hypothesis, while a p-value less than or equal to 0.05 ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) indicates rejection.

### **3.9 Model Specification**

The model for this study is specified to examine the effect of five leadership styles on organisational performance in selected hotels in Benin City, Edo State. The dependent variable is Organisational Performance (OP), while the independent variables are Transformational Leadership (TFL), Transactional Leadership (TSL), Laissez-faire Leadership (LFL), Autocratic Leadership (ATL), and Participative Leadership (PTL). The functional relationship is expressed as:

$$OP=f(TFL,TSL,LFL,ATL,PTL)$$

This functional form can be represented in a linear econometric model as:

$$OP_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TFL_i + \beta_2 TSL_i + \beta_3 LFL_i + \beta_4 ATL_i + \beta_5 PTL_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Where:

- i.  $OP_i$  = Organisational Performance for respondent  $i$
- ii.  $TFL_i$  = Transformational Leadership
- iii.  $TSL_i$  = Transactional Leadership
- iv.  $LFL_i$  = Laissez-faire Leadership
- v.  $ATL_i$  = Autocratic Leadership
- vi.  $PTL_i$  = Participative Leadership
- vii.  $\beta_0$  = Intercept term
- viii.  $\beta_1 - \beta_5$  = Coefficients of the independent variables
- ix.  $\varepsilon_i$  = Error term capturing unobserved influences

This model will be estimated using multiple linear regression analysis to determine the magnitude and significance of the effect of each leadership style on organisational performance.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

In this chapter, we delve into the empirical evaluation of data gathered from the field survey. Specifically, 134 questionnaires were disseminated to selected employees of hotels in Benin City, Edo state, including Protea Hotel, Precious Palm Royal Hotel, Uyi Grand Hotel, Western Villa Hotel, Limoh Suites and El-Hassani hotel. Impressively, same number of questionnaires were returned, processed, and utilized in our analysis, reflecting an 100% response rate.

#### **4.2 Demographic Analysis**

The demographic data of the respondents is presented in this section below.

**Table 4.1: Demographic Distribution of Respondents**

<b>Demographic Variables</b>	<b>Categories</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	60	44.8%
	Female	74	55.2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Age Range (years)</b>	Below 22	28	20.9%
	22–26	66	49.3%
	27–31	30	22.4%
	32 and above	10	7.5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Educational Qualification</b>	FSLC	4	3.0%
	ND/NCE	28	20.9%
	HND/B.Sc	85	63.4%
	M.Sc and above	17	12.7%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Employment Position</b>	Manager	23	17.2%
	Supervisor	26	19.4%
	Front Desk Officer	30	22.4%
	Other Staff	55	41.0%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Years of Experience</b>	Less than 5 years	68	50.7%
	5–10 years	51	38.1%
	Above 10 years	15	11.2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source:** Field Survey (2025)

The demographic data of the respondents, as presented in Table 4.1, provides detailed insight into the composition of participants involved in the study.

**Gender:** Out of the 134 respondents surveyed, 60 were male, accounting for 44.8% of the total sample. Female respondents made up a slightly larger proportion, with 74 individuals

representing 55.2% of the population. This suggests a female-dominated workforce in the hotel industry within the sampled group.

**Age Range:** The age distribution reveals that the majority of respondents fall within the 22–26 age bracket, comprising 66 individuals or 49.3% of the total. This is followed by 30 respondents aged between 27–31 years, making up 22.4%. Those below 22 years constituted 28 individuals or 20.9%, while only 10 respondents, representing 7.5%, were aged 32 years and above. These figures indicate that the hotel workforce is predominantly youthful, with over 92% of the staff being 31 years or younger.

**Educational Qualification:** Regarding educational background, most respondents (85 individuals or 63.4%) possessed HND/B.Sc degrees, indicating a well-educated workforce. This was followed by 28 respondents (20.9%) with ND/NCE qualifications. A smaller proportion held M.Sc and above (17 respondents or 12.7%), while only 4 individuals (3.0%) had FSLC, suggesting that very few employees lacked post-secondary education.

**Employment Position:** In terms of employment position, the largest group was classified as "Other Staff," which included 55 respondents and accounted for 41.0% of the total. Front Desk Officers followed closely with 30 respondents (22.4%), while Supervisors and Managers constituted 26 (19.4%) and 23 (17.2%) respectively. This distribution shows that a significant portion of the workforce holds non-managerial roles, with managerial and supervisory roles constituting less than 40% combined.

**Years of Experience:** Analysis of work experience indicates that the majority of respondents (68 individuals or 50.7%) had less than 5 years of experience in the hotel industry. Another 51 respondents (38.1%) had between 5–10 years of experience, while only 15 individuals (11.2%) reported over 10 years of experience. This suggests a relatively inexperienced workforce, with most employees being relatively new to the industry.

### **4.3 Descriptive Analysis of Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.**

This section presents descriptive analysis on the data retrieved from respondents using frequency count, percentage (%) and mean.

#### **4.3.1 Data Presentation and Analysis for the Dependent Variable**

The table below presents the descriptive analysis on the dependent variable (Organisational Performance) using frequency count, percentage and mean.

**Table 4.2: Descriptive Analysis of Organisational Performance (OP)**

S/N	STATEMENT	Total Responses	SA (5)f/(%)	A (4)f/(%)	U (3)f/(%)	D (2)f/(%)	SD (1)f/(%)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )
1	The hotel consistently achieves its stated goals and objectives.	134	30 (22.4%)	47 (35.1%)	28 (20.9%)	15 (11.2%)	14 (10.4%)	3.48
2	Employees in my hotel perform their duties effectively and efficiently.	134	27 (20.1%)	52 (38.8%)	28 (20.9%)	17 (12.7%)	10 (7.5%)	3.51
3	The level of customer satisfaction in this hotel is consistently high.	134	26 (19.4%)	50 (37.3%)	30 (22.4%)	12 (9.0%)	16 (11.9%)	3.43
4	The hotel's operations run smoothly and productively.	134	27 (20.1%)	49 (36.6%)	27 (20.1%)	23 (17.2%)	8 (6.0%)	3.47
5	My hotel has maintained a positive reputation due to effective management.	134	31 (23.1%)	45 (33.6%)	25 (18.7%)	18 (13.4%)	15 (11.2%)	3.44
<b>Average</b>			<b>28.2 (21.0%)</b>	<b>48.6 (36.3%)</b>	<b>27.6 (20.6%)</b>	<b>17.0 (12.7%)</b>	<b>12.6 (9.4%)</b>	<b>3.47</b>

**Source:** Field Survey (2025)

Table 4.2 provides descriptive statistics on respondents' perceptions of organisational performance within the hotel industry. In terms of strong agreement, the highest frequency was recorded in the fifth item, where 31 respondents (23.1%) strongly agreed that the hotel maintains a positive reputation due to effective management. The least strong agreement was observed in the third item (19.4%). Agreement (A) responses were highest in the

second item, with 52 respondents (38.8%), followed closely by 50 (37.3%) in the third item and 49 (36.6%) in the fourth. Neutral responses remained relatively stable across items, ranging from 18.7% to 22.4%. Disagreement (D) and Strong Disagreement (SD) were lowest in the fourth item, with only 17.2% and 6.0%, respectively, indicating positive perceptions of operational smoothness. The highest SD (11.9%) was reported in item three, regarding customer satisfaction.

The mean values for all statements ranged between 3.43 and 3.51, with the highest mean of 3.51 recorded for the statement regarding employee effectiveness, indicating a generally favourable perception. The lowest mean (3.43) was for customer satisfaction, suggesting room for improvement. On average, 21.0% of respondents strongly agreed across the items, 36.3% agreed, and 20.6% were neutral, while 12.7% disagreed and 9.4% strongly disagreed. These results reflect an overall positive assessment of organisational performance, with the majority of respondents aligning with statements that portray operational efficiency, effective personnel, and satisfactory outcomes.

#### **4.3.2 Data Presentation and Analysis for the Independent Variable**

The table below presents the descriptive analysis on the independent variables (Transformational Leadership (TFL), Transactional Leadership (TSL), Laissez-faire Leadership (LFL), Autocratic Leadership (ATL), and Participative Leadership (PTL)) using frequency count, percentage and mean.

**Table 4.3: Descriptive Analysis of Transformational Leadership (TFL)**

S/N	STATEMENT	Total Responses	SA (5)f/(%)	A (4)f/(%)	U (3)f/(%)	D (2)f/(%)	SD (1)f/(%)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )
6	My manager inspires employees to exceed normal performance expectations.	134	31 (23.1%)	50 (37.3%)	25 (18.7%)	14 (10.4%)	14 (10.4%)	3.52
7	My supervisor communicates a clear vision that motivates employees.	134	26 (19.4%)	56 (41.8%)	33 (24.6%)	12 (9.0%)	7 (5.2%)	3.61
8	I am encouraged to think creatively and contribute innovative ideas.	134	26 (19.4%)	60 (44.8%)	30 (22.4%)	10 (7.5%)	8 (6.0%)	3.63
9	My manager recognises and rewards outstanding employee performance.	134	31 (23.1%)	43 (32.1%)	35 (26.1%)	15 (11.2%)	10 (7.5%)	3.52
10	My manager supports my career growth and development.	134	30 (22.4%)	43 (32.1%)	35 (26.1%)	17 (12.7%)	9 (6.7%)	3.51
	<b>Average</b>		<b>28.8 (21.5%)</b>	<b>50.4 (37.6%)</b>	<b>31.6 (23.6%)</b>	<b>13.6 (10.2%)</b>	<b>9.6 (7.2%)</b>	<b>3.56</b>

**Source:** Field Survey (2025)

Table 4.3 presents the descriptive analysis of transformational leadership practices in the hotel sector. Among all five items, the highest agreement was recorded in item 8, where 60 respondents (44.8%) agreed that they are encouraged to think creatively. This was followed by 56 (41.8%) and 50 (37.3%) who agreed with items 7 and 6 respectively. Strong agreement peaked at 23.1% for both items 6 and 9. Meanwhile, neutral responses were notably high for items 9 and 10 (26.1% each), indicating some level of uncertainty about recognition and career support. Disagreement and strong disagreement were lowest for item 7, with only 9.0% and 5.2%, respectively, suggesting that communication of vision was more positively perceived.

The mean scores across all items ranged from 3.51 to 3.63, reflecting an overall moderate to high perception of transformational leadership. On average, 21.5% of respondents strongly agreed and 37.6% agreed, indicating a positive skew in responses. Neutral responses averaged 23.6%, while 10.2% disagreed and 7.2% strongly disagreed. These findings imply that transformational leadership attributes—particularly inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, recognition, and support—are generally present in the managerial practices within the surveyed hotels, although opportunities remain for stronger emphasis on employee development and performance feedback.

**Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics of Transactional Leadership (TSL)**

S/ N	STATEMENT	Total Response s	SA (5)f/(%) )	A (4)f/(%) )	U (3)f/(%) )	D (2)f/(%) )	SD (1)f/(%) )	Mea n ( $\bar{x}$ )
11	My supervisor uses rewards to encourage good performance.	134	30 (22.4%)	48 (35.8%)	32 (23.9%)	12 (9.0%)	12 (9.0%)	3.54
12	I am held accountable for not meeting performance targets.	134	26 (19.4%)	53 (39.6%)	29 (21.6%)	16 (11.9%)	10 (7.5%)	3.52
13	Management clearly defines performance expectations.	134	32 (23.9%)	52 (38.8%)	33 (24.6%)	9 (6.7%)	8 (6.0%)	3.67
14	Feedback is given based on achievement of measurable goals.	134	38 (28.4%)	44 (32.8%)	27 (20.1%)	17 (12.7%)	8 (6.0%)	3.64
15	My performance is regularly evaluated to ensure compliance with standards.	134	28 (20.9%)	55 (41.0%)	28 (20.9%)	13 (9.7%)	10 (7.5%)	3.59
	<b>Average</b>		<b>30.8 (23.0%) )</b>	<b>50.4 (37.6%) )</b>	<b>29.8 (22.2%) )</b>	<b>13.4 (10.0%) )</b>	<b>9.6 (7.2%)</b>	<b>3.59</b>

**Source:** Field Survey (2025)

Table 4.4 presents the descriptive analysis of transactional leadership practices among hotel employees. The most agreed-upon statement was item 15, with 55 respondents (41.0%) affirming that their performance is regularly evaluated. Similarly, the highest level

of strong agreement (28.4%) was found in item 14, indicating that many respondents believe feedback is based on measurable outcomes. Neutral responses were highest in item 13 (24.6%), which relates to the clarity of performance expectations, suggesting some uncertainty remains in this area. Disagreement and strong disagreement levels were lowest in item 13, with only 6.7% and 6.0% respectively, suggesting general consensus around clear communication from management.

Mean scores across the five items ranged from 3.52 to 3.67, with item 13 scoring the highest. These values indicate a moderate to high level of perceived transactional leadership. On average, 23.0% of respondents strongly agreed and 37.6% agreed, while 22.2% were neutral, 10.0% disagreed, and 7.2% strongly disagreed. These findings suggest that transactional leadership behaviours—such as using rewards, defining expectations, giving structured feedback, and evaluating performance—are widely practiced and recognised within the hotel organisations surveyed.

**Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics of Laissez-Faire Leadership (LFL)**

S/N	STATEMENT	Total Responses	SA (5)f/(%)	A (4)f/(%)	U (3)f/(%)	D (2)f/(%)	SD (1)f/(%)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )
16	My manager allows employees to make decisions independently.	134	28 (20.9%)	34 (25.4%)	35 (26.1%)	24 (17.9%)	13 (9.7%)	3.30
17	I work with minimal supervision from my superior.	134	35 (26.1%)	36 (26.9%)	37 (27.6%)	20 (14.9%)	6 (4.5%)	3.54
18	Supervisors in my hotel rarely interfere in employees' tasks.	134	28 (20.9%)	41 (30.6%)	33 (24.6%)	24 (17.9%)	8 (6.0%)	3.42
19	I am expected to solve work-related problems on my own.	134	32 (23.9%)	41 (30.6%)	29 (21.6%)	21 (15.7%)	11 (8.2%)	3.46
20	My manager gives employees full autonomy in carrying out their duties.	134	27 (20.1%)	47 (35.1%)	33 (24.6%)	18 (13.4%)	9 (6.7%)	3.48
	<b>Average</b>		<b>30.0 (22.4%)</b>	<b>39.8 (29.6%)</b>	<b>33.4 (24.9%)</b>	<b>21.4 (16.0%)</b>	<b>9.4 (7.0%)</b>	<b>3.44</b>

**Source:** Field Survey (2025)

Table 4.5 highlights respondents' perceptions of laissez-faire leadership practices in their hotel settings. The most frequent agreement was seen in item 20, with 47 respondents (35.1%) affirming that their managers grant full autonomy. Similarly, the highest strong agreement (26.1%) was recorded in item 17, indicating that a significant number work with

minimal supervision. Neutral responses were prevalent across all items, especially in item 17 (27.6%) and item 16 (26.1%), suggesting mixed experiences or uncertainty regarding autonomy and managerial involvement. Disagreement and strong disagreement were most evident in item 16, where 24 (17.9%) disagreed and 13 (9.7%) strongly disagreed with the statement on independent decision-making.

The mean scores ranged between 3.30 and 3.54, with the highest for item 17 (minimal supervision) and the lowest for item 16 (decision-making independence). On average, 22.4% of respondents strongly agreed, 29.6% agreed, and 24.9% were neutral, indicating a fairly balanced perception. Meanwhile, 16.0% disagreed and 7.0% strongly disagreed overall. These results suggest that laissez-faire leadership traits are moderately present, with noticeable autonomy given to employees, but also a significant portion of staff who either remain neutral or feel less empowered in making independent decisions.

**Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics of Autocratic Leadership (ATL)**

S/N	STATEMENT	Total Responses	SA (5)f/(%)	A (4)f/(%)	U (3)f/(%)	D (2)f/(%)	SD (1)f/(%)	Mean ( $\bar{x}$ )
21	Decisions in my hotel are made solely by top management.	134	33 (24.6%)	54 (40.3%)	28 (20.9%)	13 (9.7%)	6 (4.5%)	3.71
22	Employees are expected to follow instructions without questioning.	134	30 (22.4%)	45 (33.6%)	36 (26.9%)	14 (10.4%)	9 (6.7%)	3.55
23	My manager rarely seeks employees' input before making decisions.	134	32 (23.9%)	40 (29.9%)	38 (28.4%)	15 (11.2%)	9 (6.7%)	3.52
24	Strict rules are enforced by management with little flexibility.	134	29 (21.6%)	52 (38.8%)	27 (20.1%)	17 (12.7%)	9 (6.7%)	3.56
25	Employee feedback is often ignored in my hotel.	134	26 (19.4%)	49 (36.6%)	35 (26.1%)	19 (14.2%)	5 (3.7%)	3.54
	<b>Average</b>		<b>30.0 (22.4%)</b>	<b>48.0 (35.8%)</b>	<b>32.8 (24.5%)</b>	<b>15.6 (11.6%)</b>	<b>7.6 (5.7%)</b>	<b>3.58</b>

**Source:** Field Survey (2025)

Table 4.6 presents the descriptive statistics on respondents' perceptions of autocratic leadership within hotel organisations. The highest level of agreement (40.3%) was observed in item 21, where respondents acknowledged that decisions are often made solely by top management. This was closely followed by item 24 (38.8%) regarding the enforcement of strict rules. Strong agreement was relatively consistent across items, ranging from 19.4% to 24.6%, with item 21 recording the highest. Neutral responses were also frequent, particularly in item 23 (28.4%) and item 22 (26.9%), suggesting that a considerable proportion of employees neither confirm nor deny autocratic tendencies. Disagreement and strong disagreement levels were generally low, with item 25 showing the least strong disagreement (3.7%).

Mean scores ranged from 3.52 to 3.71, with the highest recorded in item 21, indicating that centralised decision-making is strongly perceived among respondents. On average, 22.4% of participants strongly agreed, 35.8% agreed, and 24.5% remained neutral, reflecting a dominant perception of autocratic leadership traits. Disagreement and strong disagreement averaged 11.6% and 5.7%, respectively. These findings imply that autocratic leadership practices—marked by top-down decisions, limited employee input, and rigid rule enforcement—are evidently present in the hotel work environment, though not overwhelmingly dominant.

**Table 4.7: Descriptive Statistics of Participative Leadership (PTL)**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>STATEMENT</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>SA (5)f/(%)</b>	<b>A (4)f/(%)</b>	<b>U (3)f/(%)</b>	<b>D (2)f/(%)</b>	<b>SD (1)f/(%)</b>	<b>Mean (<math>\bar{x}</math>)</b>
26	My manager encourages team members to share their opinions.	134	28 (20.9%)	57 (42.5%)	27 (20.1%)	14 (10.4%)	8 (6.0%)	3.62
27	I feel that my ideas are valued during decision-making.	134	33 (24.6%)	48 (35.8%)	38 (28.4%)	11 (8.2%)	4 (3.0%)	3.70
28	Employees and managers collaborate to solve problems.	134	35 (26.1%)	56 (41.8%)	25 (18.7%)	10 (7.5%)	8 (6.0%)	3.74
29	Management involves staff in setting organisational goals.	134	29 (21.6%)	50 (37.3%)	37 (27.6%)	11 (8.2%)	7 (5.2%)	3.62
30	I am comfortable discussing work-related issues with my manager.	134	21 (15.7%)	56 (41.8%)	33 (24.6%)	13 (9.7%)	11 (8.2%)	3.47
	<b>Average</b>		<b>29.2 (21.8%)</b>	<b>53.4 (39.8%)</b>	<b>32.0 (23.9%)</b>	<b>11.8 (8.8%)</b>	<b>7.6 (5.7%)</b>	<b>3.63</b>

**Source:** Field Survey (2025)

Table 4.7 presents the descriptive statistics on participative leadership among respondents. The highest agreement was recorded in item 28, where 56 respondents (41.8%) agreed that employees and managers collaborate to solve problems, while 35 (26.1%) strongly agreed. A similar trend appeared in item 26, where 57 respondents (42.5%) agreed that managers encourage sharing of opinions. Neutral responses were most frequent in item 27 (28.4%) and item 29 (27.6%), showing that some employees may feel less involved in certain participatory processes. Disagreement levels were generally moderate, ranging between 7.5% and 10.4%, while strong disagreement was minimal across all items, indicating broad approval of participative practices.

The mean scores ranged between 3.47 and 3.74, with the highest recorded for item 28 (3.74), implying strong collaboration between staff and management. The lowest mean (3.47) was associated with openness to discussing work issues, suggesting that communication, while generally positive, could be further improved. On average, 21.8% strongly agreed, 39.8% agreed, and 23.9% were neutral, while only 8.8% disagreed and 5.7% strongly disagreed. These results indicate a dominant culture of participative leadership within the hotels, characterised by employee inclusion in decision-making and a supportive environment that values communication and shared problem-solving.

#### **4.4 Correlation Analysis of Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria**

The results from the correlation analysis provide insights into the character and orientation of the connection between the dependent and independent variables. While the correlation coefficient doesn't denote a direct functional dependence, it serves as a preliminary indicator of the strength and trend of this relationship. The details of these findings will be elaborated upon in the subsequent discussion.

**Table 4.8: Correlation Results of Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria**

**Correlations**

		OP	TFL	TSL	LFL	ATL	PTL
OP	Pearson Correlation	1					
	Sig. (1-tailed)						
	N	134					
TFL	Pearson Correlation	.751**	1				
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000					
	N	134	134				
TSL	Pearson Correlation	.681**	.761**	1			
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000				
	N	134	134	134			
LFL	Pearson Correlation	.493**	.542**	.582**	1		
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000			
	N	134	134	134	134		
ATL	Pearson Correlation	.408**	.417**	.540**	.583**	1	
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		
	N	134	134	134	134	134	
PTL	Pearson Correlation	.562**	.636**	.570**	.633**	.475**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

**Source: Author's Estimation from SPSS 22, 2025.**

Table 4.8 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients showing the relationship between various leadership styles and organisational performance (OP) in selected hotels in Benin City, Edo State. All leadership styles examined—transformational (TFL), transactional (TSL), laissez-faire (LFL), autocratic (ATL), and participative (PTL)—exhibited statistically significant positive relationships with organisational performance at the 0.01 level. Transformational leadership had the strongest correlation with OP ( $r = .751, p < .01$ ), indicating a strong and positive influence, followed closely by transactional leadership ( $r = .681, p < .01$ ). Participative leadership also showed a moderate to strong correlation with OP ( $r = .562, p < .01$ ), while laissez-faire ( $r = .493, p < .01$ ) and autocratic leadership ( $r = .408, p < .01$ ) had relatively weaker but still significant correlations. These findings suggest that while all styles contribute to organisational performance, transformational leadership exerts the most substantial effect, reinforcing its critical role in achieving superior outcomes within the hospitality sector.

Furthermore, none of the variables have a coefficient value greater than 0.80, indicating the presence of a multicollinearity problem, which denotes a situation in which some of the explanatory variables in a model are correlated, limiting and altering the efficiency of the regression results.

#### 4.5 Hypothesis Testing

The research hypotheses were tested utilising regression analysis in order to achieve the current study's objectives. The hypotheses were evaluated with an Alpha level of significance of 0.05 (Decision rule: computed level of significance <0.05, reject null hypothesis; computed level of significance >0.05, accept null hypothesis).

**Table 4.9a Model Summary of Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria**

#### Model Summary<sup>b</sup>

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	RStd. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	Durbin-Watson
1	.775 <sup>a</sup>	.600	.584	.63569	.600	38.388	5	128	.000	2.198

a. Predictors: (Constant), PTL, ATL, TSL, LFL, TFL

b. Dependent Variable: OP

#### Source: Statistical Package for social Sciences v.22

Table 4.9a presents the model summary of the multiple regression analysis assessing the effect of leadership styles (transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, autocratic, and participative) on organisational performance in selected hotels in Benin City. The model shows a multiple correlation coefficient (R) of 0.775, indicating a strong positive

relationship between the combined leadership styles and organisational performance. The R Square value of 0.600 implies that approximately 60% of the variance in organisational performance is explained by the five leadership styles included in the model. The adjusted R Square of 0.584 further confirms the model’s goodness-of-fit, accounting for the number of predictors. The standard error of estimate (0.63569) indicates a moderate dispersion around the predicted values. The F-statistic (38.388) and its significance level ( $p = .000$ ) show that the overall model is statistically significant. Additionally, the Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.198 falls within the acceptable range (1.5–2.5), indicating no serious autocorrelation issues in the residuals. Thus, the model is robust and reliable for explaining the impact of leadership styles on organisational performance in the studied context.

**Table 4.9b Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria**

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	77.563	5	15.513	38.388	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	51.725	128	.404		
	Total	129.288	133			

a. Dependent Variable: OP

b. Predictors: (Constant), PTL, ATL, TSL, LFL, TFL

**Source: Statistical Package for social Sciences v.22**

Table 4.9b presents the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results for the regression model assessing the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance in selected hotels in

Benin City. The regression model yielded a sum of squares of 77.563 with 5 degrees of freedom, while the residual sum of squares was 51.725 with 128 degrees of freedom, resulting in a total sum of squares of 129.288. The calculated F-value of 38.388 is statistically significant at  $p < 0.001$ , indicating that the overall regression model is highly significant. This means that the combined effect of the five leadership styles—participative, autocratic, transactional, laissez-faire, and transformational—is a significant predictor of organisational performance. Therefore, leadership style exerts a meaningful influence on performance outcomes in the hotel industry within the study area.

**Table 4.9c Regression Output of Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria**

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	.081	.286		.284	.777		
TFL	.558	.103	.505	5.393	.000	.357	2.803
TSL	.234	.100	.220	2.335	.021	.351	2.846
LFL	.021	.087	.020	.241	.810	.469	2.134
ATL	.028	.083	.025	.337	.736	.590	1.696
PTL	.107	.096	.091	1.118	.266	.472	2.120

a. Dependent Variable: OP

**Source: Statistical Package for social Sciences v.22**

Table 4.9c presents the regression coefficients for the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance in selected hotels in Benin City. The unstandardised coefficients (B) show the individual contribution of each leadership style to organisational performance, while the standardised coefficients (Beta) indicate their relative importance.

Among the five leadership styles, transformational leadership (TFL) had the most substantial and statistically significant effect on organisational performance ( $B = 0.558$ ,  $\beta = 0.505$ ,  $t = 5.393$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This suggests that for every one-unit increase in transformational leadership, organisational performance increases by 0.558 units, holding other variables constant. Transactional leadership (TSL) also had a significant positive effect ( $B = 0.234$ ,  $\beta = 0.220$ ,  $t = 2.335$ ,  $p = 0.021$ ), indicating it is the second most influential predictor.

In contrast, laissez-faire (LFL), autocratic (ATL), and participative (PTL) leadership styles had positive but statistically insignificant effects on organisational performance (p-values = 0.810, 0.736, and 0.266, respectively). This implies that these styles, while present, do not meaningfully predict organisational performance in this context.

The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all predictors ranged from 1.696 to 2.846, which are within the acceptable limit ( $< 5$ ), indicating no multicollinearity concerns. In summary, the regression results affirm that transformational and transactional leadership

styles are significant positive drivers of organisational performance, with transformational leadership being the most impactful.

### **Hypothesis i**

**Null Hypothesis (Ho<sub>1</sub>):** *Transformational leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.*

From Table 4.9c, transformational leadership (TFL) has a p-value of 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 significance level, with a positive coefficient ( $B = 0.558$ ) and a high standardized beta ( $\beta = 0.505$ ), indicating a strong and statistically significant impact on organisational performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and it is concluded that transformational leadership has a significant positive effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.

### **Hypothesis ii**

**Null Hypothesis (Ho<sub>2</sub>):** *Transactional leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.*

Transactional leadership (TSL) recorded a p-value of 0.021, which is less than 0.05, and a positive coefficient ( $B = 0.234$ ,  $\beta = 0.220$ ), showing that it significantly contributes to organisational performance. Based on this result, the null hypothesis is rejected, and it is concluded that transactional leadership has a significant positive effect on organisational performance in the hotels surveyed.

### **Hypothesis iii**

**Null Hypothesis (Ho<sub>3</sub>):** *Laissez-faire leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.*

Laissez-faire leadership (LFL) has a p-value of 0.810, which is greater than 0.05, and a negligible coefficient ( $B = 0.021$ ,  $\beta = 0.020$ ), suggesting no meaningful or statistically significant effect on organisational performance. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, and it is concluded that laissez-faire leadership does not significantly affect organisational performance in the selected hotels.

### **Hypothesis iv**

**Null Hypothesis (Ho<sub>4</sub>):** *Autocratic leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.*

The result for autocratic leadership (ATL) shows a p-value of 0.736, which is greater than 0.05, with a low coefficient ( $B = 0.028$ ,  $\beta = 0.025$ ), indicating no significant contribution to organisational performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, confirming that autocratic leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in the hotels examined.

### **Hypothesis v**

**Null Hypothesis (Ho<sub>5</sub>):** *Participative leadership has no significant effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City.*

Participative leadership (PTL) recorded a p-value of 0.266, which is greater than 0.05, along with a modest coefficient ( $B = 0.107$ ,  $\beta = 0.091$ ), indicating that its effect is not statistically significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted, and it is concluded that participative leadership does not have a significant effect on organisational performance in the context of this study.

## **4.6 Discussion of Findings**

### **4.6.1. Transformational Leadership and Organisational Performance**

The current study found that transformational leadership had a strong and statistically significant positive effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City ( $\beta = 0.505$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This suggests that hotel managers who inspire, motivate, and intellectually stimulate their staff contribute significantly to achieving organisational goals. This aligns with several existing studies in the empirical literature. For instance, Afolabi (2023) and Abubakar and Ahmed (2021) both confirmed the superior influence of transformational leadership on performance in Nigerian healthcare and university settings, respectively. Their findings support the view that transformational leadership enhances employee engagement, innovation, and strategic alignment, which are critical to achieving high performance. Similarly, Dele et al. (2015), in the banking sector, showed that transformational leadership promotes innovation and long-term strategic success. This consistency across sectors suggests that the positive influence of transformational

leadership on performance is robust, context-sensitive, and essential for service-oriented industries like hospitality.

#### **4.6.2. Transactional Leadership and Organisational Performance**

Transactional leadership also showed a significant positive impact on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.220$ ,  $p = 0.021$ ) in this study. This result reinforces the importance of clear structures, performance monitoring, and reward-based systems in achieving operational efficiency. The findings are in line with Afolabi (2023) and Dele et al. (2015), who reported that transactional leadership—while more mechanistic—provides necessary day-to-day control and compliance essential for effective operations, especially in structured environments. Likewise, Saasongu (2015) emphasised the usefulness of transactional leadership in the early stages of SME development due to its clarity and performance-based reinforcement. The implication here is that transactional leadership, although not as visionary as transformational leadership, remains an effective tool in ensuring short-term goals are met, particularly in industries like hospitality where service delivery and accountability are paramount.

#### **4.6.3. Laissez-Faire Leadership and Organisational Performance**

Laissez-faire leadership demonstrated a positive but statistically insignificant effect on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.020$ ,  $p = 0.810$ ) in the current study. This finding suggests that a leadership style characterised by minimal supervision and delegation of authority does not significantly contribute to performance outcomes in hotel environments.

This result contrasts with the findings of Dim and Nzube (2020) and Alade (2022), who reported a positive influence of laissez-faire leadership in manufacturing and general organisational settings. However, it aligns more closely with Parveen et al. (2022) and Lawal et al. (2014), both of whom noted that laissez-faire leadership was largely ineffective, especially in environments where structured supervision and accountability are crucial. In the context of hospitality, where service quality is closely monitored, excessive autonomy without direction may hinder performance, reaffirming the need for a more engaged leadership approach.

#### **4.6.4. Autocratic Leadership and Organisational Performance**

The findings show that autocratic leadership had an insignificant influence on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.025$ ,  $p = 0.736$ ), indicating that top-down decision-making and rigid control structures do not significantly enhance performance outcomes in the hotel industry. This aligns with the conclusions of Afolabi (2023) and Alade (2022), both of whom observed that autocratic leadership often results in lower employee morale and diminished performance, especially in people-centric sectors. Lawal et al. (2014) also reported that despite the prevalence of autocratic leadership in SMEs, it failed to deliver meaningful gains in effectiveness. However, Parveen et al. (2022) found a positive effect of autocratic leadership in secondary schools, showing the potential for contextual variation. In the case of hospitality, where teamwork, communication, and customer

interaction are essential, autocratic leadership may suppress employee initiative, resulting in limited performance outcomes.

#### **4.6.5. Participative Leadership and Organisational Performance**

Participative leadership (PTL) in this study had a positive but non-significant impact on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.091$ ,  $p = 0.266$ ), suggesting that although participatory decision-making is perceived positively, it does not significantly drive measurable performance improvements in the hotels surveyed. This finding partly contrasts with Alade (2022) and Ibrahim and Daniel (2019), both of whom highlighted the effectiveness of democratic or participatory leadership in enhancing organisational behaviour and employee performance. However, it aligns with Olajide and Okunbanjo (2018), who found that participative leadership did not significantly reduce turnover or drive performance in the banking sector unless complemented by empowering structures. This suggests that while participative leadership may enhance organisational climate and employee satisfaction, it may not directly influence output unless supported by other strategic mechanisms such as delegation, accountability, and performance incentives—particularly in operationally intensive sectors like hospitality.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the summary of the major findings, draws conclusions based on the research objectives and hypotheses, and offers practical recommendations for improving organisational performance through employee involvement. The chapter also highlights the study's contribution to knowledge and proposes suggestions for further research. It is structured into the following sections: summary of findings, conclusion, recommendations, contribution to knowledge, and suggestions for future studies.

#### **5.2 Summary of Findings**

This study investigated the effect of leadership styles on organisational performance. Specifically, 134 questionnaires were disseminated to selected employees of hotels in Benin City, Edo state, including Protea Hotel, Precious Palm Royal Hotel, Uyi Grand Hotel, Western Villa Hotel, Limoh Suites and El-Hassani hotel. Impressively, same number of questionnaires were returned, processed, and utilized in our analysis. The analysis employed both descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, and mean) and inferential statistics (regression analysis) using SPSS version 22.

Key findings are summarised below:

- i. The current study found that transformational leadership had a strong and statistically significant positive effect on organisational performance in hotels in Benin City ( $\beta = 0.505$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This suggests that hotel managers who inspire, motivate, and intellectually stimulate their staff contribute significantly to achieving organisational goals.
- ii. Transactional leadership also showed a significant positive impact on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.220$ ,  $p = 0.021$ ) in this study. This result reinforces the importance of clear structures, performance monitoring, and reward-based systems in achieving operational efficiency.
- iii. Laissez-faire leadership demonstrated a positive but statistically insignificant effect on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.020$ ,  $p = 0.810$ ) in the current study. This finding suggests that a leadership style characterised by minimal supervision and delegation of authority does not significantly contribute to performance outcomes in hotel environments.
- iv. The findings show that autocratic leadership had an insignificant influence on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.025$ ,  $p = 0.736$ ), indicating that top-down decision-making and rigid control structures do not significantly enhance performance outcomes in the hotel industry.

- v. Participative leadership (PTL) in this study had a positive but non-significant impact on organisational performance ( $\beta = 0.091$ ,  $p = 0.266$ ), suggesting that although participatory decision-making is perceived positively, it does not significantly drive measurable performance improvements in the hotels surveyed.

### **5.3 Conclusion**

This study examined the impact of various leadership styles on organisational performance within the hospitality sector in Benin City, Edo State, focusing on six prominent hotels. The empirical analysis revealed that transformational and transactional leadership styles significantly and positively influence organisational performance, with transformational leadership showing a particularly strong effect. In contrast, laissez-faire, autocratic, and participative leadership styles demonstrated positive but statistically insignificant effects on performance outcomes. These findings suggest that while some degree of structure and rewards (transactional) is beneficial, it is the more inspirational and intellectually stimulating aspects of transformational leadership that truly drive organisational success in the hotel industry. In conclusion, leadership effectiveness in hospitality contexts is closely linked to the ability of leaders to engage, inspire, and empower their workforce rather than relying on rigid controls or detached managerial approaches.

## **5.4 Practical Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following practical recommendations are offered:

- i. Hotel management should prioritise training and development programs that equip leaders with skills in visionary thinking, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation, as this style had the strongest positive influence on performance.
- ii. Hotel administrators should continue to implement and refine performance-based reward systems and clear role definitions, which can help reinforce discipline, accountability, and short-term goal achievement.
- iii. Since this leadership style showed no significant effect, its application should be minimised, especially in operationally intensive environments like hotels. Leaders should ensure proactive supervision and timely decision-making to avoid performance stagnation.
- iv. Given the insignificant effect of autocratic leadership, hotel leaders should avoid overly rigid or top-down approaches. Instead, they should strive to balance control with engagement, especially when making decisions that affect employee morale and service delivery.

- v. Although participative leadership did not yield a statistically significant result, its positive orientation indicates potential value. Hotels should work on deepening employee involvement in strategic planning and problem-solving processes to foster a more inclusive and motivated workforce.

### **5.5 Contribution to Knowledge**

This study contributes to the leadership and organisational performance literature by providing context-specific empirical evidence from the Nigerian hospitality sector—a relatively underexplored domain in Sub-Saharan Africa. It extends prior findings by demonstrating that while multiple leadership styles may coexist in hotel operations, transformational leadership is the most effective in driving performance outcomes. The study also challenges the general assumption that participative leadership always yields significant performance gains, suggesting instead that contextual and industry-specific factors may mediate this relationship. Furthermore, the findings offer a nuanced understanding of how leadership dynamics interact with operational realities in service-intensive environments, and they provide a robust empirical foundation for future leadership training and policy formulation within the hotel industry.

### **5.6 Suggestions for Further Studies**

Future research should consider expanding the scope beyond hotels in Benin City to include a broader range of hospitality establishments across different regions of Nigeria or

other West African countries. This would allow for comparative analysis across geographic and cultural contexts and help identify regional or systemic differences in the effectiveness of leadership styles on organisational outcomes. Additionally, incorporating variables such as employee engagement, customer satisfaction, and innovation capacity as mediators or outcomes could yield richer insights into how leadership styles translate into broader organisational success.

Moreover, it is recommended that future studies adopt a mixed-method approach, combining quantitative analysis with qualitative insights through interviews or focus group discussions. Such an approach would provide a deeper understanding of why certain leadership styles succeed or fail in specific settings by capturing the lived experiences, perceptions, and contextual nuances of employees and managers. Longitudinal studies would also be valuable in assessing how leadership interventions impact performance over time, especially in a dynamic industry such as hospitality that is highly sensitive to economic, social, and technological changes.

## REFERENCES

- Abubakar, A., & Ahmed, S. (2021). The effect of a transformational leadership style on the performance of universities in Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation (PJERE)*, 2(1).
- Afolabi, A. R. (2023). *Impact of organisational leadership styles on employee performance – A case study of a selected healthcare sector in Nigeria* (Doctoral dissertation, Dublin, National College of Ireland).
- Ahsan, M. J., & Khalid, M. H. (2023). Laissez-faire leadership. In *Leadership approaches in global hospitality and tourism* (pp. 61–72). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-7618-6.ch004>
- Ajeigbe, I. Y., Owolabi, A. Y., & Alasinrin, S. (2021). Relationship between leadership styles of sports administrators and organisational development in Ilorin Metropolis, Nigeria. *Indonesian Journal of Sport Management*, 1(1), 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.31949/ijsm.v1i1.1363>
- Ajibade, O. E., Ajayi, T. O., & Shobowale, O. (2017). Leadership style and employees' performance in Nigerian federal polytechnics: A study of Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun State. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, 11(1), 17–30.
- Akparep, J. Y., Jengre, E., & Mogre, A. A. (2019). The influence of leadership style on organizational performance at TumaKavi Development Association, Tamale, Northern Region of Ghana. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 7(2), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijstrm/v7i2.em01>
- Alade, A. O. (2022). The effects of leadership styles on organizational behavior and performance in some selected organizations in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 22(3), e2544. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2544>
- Alsarrani, W. I., Jusoh, A., Alhaseri, A. A., & Almeharish, A. (2021). A literature review study of the relationship between leadership style, leadership behaviour, and leadership traits. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 9(4), 152–159. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2021.9417>
- Anderson, D. W., & Hamman, J. J. (2024). *The essence of leadership: Maintaining emotional independence in situations requiring change*. Productivity Press.
- Ansari, M. S. A., Abouraia, M., El Morsy, R., & Thumiki, V. R. R. (2024). Influence of transformational and transactional leadership on agile project success. *Project Leadership and Society*, 5, 100136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plas.2023.100136>
- Bititci, U. S. (2015). *Managing business performance: The science and the art*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., & Hawkins, B. (2023). *Exploring leadership*. Oxford University Press.

- Bwambale, A., Mulegi, T., & Bulhan, S. (2024). The effect of laissez-faire leadership style on academic performance of primary school pupils in selected primary schools in Kasese district. *IAA Journal of Education*, *10*(1), 23–28.
- Carneiro-da-Cunha, J. A., Hourneaux Jr, F., & Corrêa, H. L. (2016). Evolution and chronology of the organisational performance measurement field. *International Journal of Business Performance Management*, *17*(2), 223–240. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBPM.2016.074455>
- Covey, S. M., Kasperson, D., Covey, M., & Judd, G. T. (2022). *Trust and inspire: How truly great leaders unleash greatness in others*. Simon and Schuster.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *13*(1), 46–78. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(75\)90005-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(75)90005-7)
- Dasmadi, D. (2023). Leadership models in modern organizations. *Enrichment: Journal of Management*, *12*(6), 4646–4650.
- Dele, A. O., Adegboyega, O. I., & Taiwo, A. K. (2015). An empirical investigation of leadership styles and their effect on organizational performance of banks in Ado Ekiti, Nigeria. *International Journal of Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, *1*(2), 49–55.
- Dharejo, S., Hussain, N., Farooq, S. M., Kalwar, M. S., & Mallah, W. R. (2021). Examining the effect of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership on employee involvement and performance. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Technology*, *12*(2), 557–567.
- Dim, E., & Nzube, C. A. (2020). Effect of leadership styles on organizational performance of selected foam manufacturing firms in Anambra State. *International Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship*, *2*(1), 13–27.
- Dong, B. (2023). A systematic review of the transactional leadership literature and future outlook. *Academic Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *2*(3), 21–25.
- e Cunha, M. P., Clegg, S. R., Rego, A., & Berti, M. (2021). *Paradoxes of power and leadership*. Routledge.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 219–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)
- Guthrie, K. L., & Devies, B. (2024). *Foundations of leadership: Principles, practice, and progress*. IAP.

- Hossin, M. M., Azam, M. S., & Hossain, M. S. (2023). Leadership in SMEs: A review of different leadership styles and their relevance to SME management. *Asian Journal of Management, Entrepreneurship and Social Science*, 3(1), 70–92.
- Houlihan, F. (2021). *Autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles: Is there a link between these leadership styles and absenteeism/withdrawal amongst millennials?* (Doctoral dissertation, National College of Ireland).
- House, R. J. (1971). A path–goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3), 321–339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905>
- Ibrahim, A. U., & Daniel, C. O. (2019). Impact of leadership on organisational performance. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Research*, 6(2), 367–374.
- Iszatt-White, M., & Saunders, C. (2017). *Leadership*. Oxford University Press.
- Jain, V., Gupta, S. S., Shankar, K. T., & Bagaria, K. R. (2022). A study on leadership management, principles, theories, and educational management. *World Journal of English Language*, 12(3), 203–211.
- Kabir, A. A., Okuboyejo, S., Ilori, G. E., & Adeogun, O. S. (2016). Influence of organizational leadership on organizational performance in the service sector in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 4(12), 574–590.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2023). *The leadership challenge workbook*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ladkin, D., & Patrick, C. B. (2022). Whiteness in leadership theorizing: A critical analysis of race in Bass’ transformational leadership theory. *Leadership*, 18(2), 205–223.
- Lawal, A. A., Ajonbadi, H. A., & Otokiti, B. O. (2014). Leadership and organisational performance in the Nigeria small and medium enterprises (SMEs). *American Journal of Business, Economics and Management*, 2(5), 121.
- Leary, T., & Miller, M. (2021). The toxic relationship between laissez-faire leadership and employee burnout: No longer a well-kept secret. *International Leadership Journal*, 13(2).
- Malhotra, G., Dandotiya, G., Shaiwalini, S., Khan, A., & Homechaudhuri, S. (2025). Benchmarking for organisational competitiveness: A resource-based view perspective. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 32(3), 943–964. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-02-2022-0083>
- Manu, A. (2022). Transformational leadership. In *The philosophy of disruption: From transition to transformational change* (pp. 67–77). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Marr, B., & Gray, D. (2012). *Strategic performance management*. Routledge.
- Mekonnen, M., & Bayissa, Z. (2023). The effect of transformational and transactional leadership styles on organizational readiness for change among health

- professionals. *SAGE Open Nursing*, 9, 23779608231185923. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608231185923>
- Mohammad, A. K. (2014). *Measurement and improvement of organisational performance using model of performance analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia).
- Montano, D., Schleu, J. E., & Hüffmeier, J. (2023). A meta-analysis of the relative contribution of leadership styles to followers' mental health. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 30(1), 90–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518221122945>
- Ng, H. S., & Kee, D. M. H. (2011). Key intangible performance indicators (KIPs) for organisational success: The literature review. *International Journal of Asian Business and Information Management (IJABIM)*, 2(3), 1–14.
- Northouse, P. G. (2025). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (10th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Nurani, D. W., Samdin, S., Nasrul, N., & Sukotjo, E. (2021). The effect of leadership style on organizational commitment and employee performance: An empirical study from Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(12), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no12.0141>
- O'Boyle, I. (2015). *Organisational performance management in sport*. Routledge.
- Olajide, O. T., & Okunbanjo, O. I. (2018). Leadership style, employee empowerment and organisational performance in Nigerian banking industry. *BVIMSR Journal of Management Research*, 10(2), 135–142.
- Olayisade, A., & Awolusi, O. D. (2021). The effect of leadership styles on employee's productivity in the Nigerian oil and gas industry. *Information Management and Business Review*, 13(1), 47–64.
- Oyelade, K. A., Akpa, V. O., Olawore, O. P., Adesanya, A. S., & James, M. T. (2022). Transactional leadership style and market share of selected SMEs in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Resource & Leadership*, 6(2), 57–71.
- Parveen, K., Tran, Q. B., Kumar, T., & Shah, A. H. (2022, May). Impact of principal leadership styles on teacher job performance: An empirical investigation. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 814159. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.814159>
- Rachmad, Y. E. (2022). *Leadership Behavior Theory*. Maastricht Verdrag Boek Internationale Uitgeverij, Speciale Editie 2022.
- Rachmad, Y. E. (2022). *Leadership Flexibility Theory*. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/download/119365080/BOOK\\_2022\\_095\\_NEW.pdf](https://www.academia.edu/download/119365080/BOOK_2022_095_NEW.pdf)
- Robert, V., & Vandenberghe, C. (2021). Laissez-faire leadership and affective commitment: The roles of leader–member exchange and subordinate relational self-concept. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36(4), 533–551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09708-7>

- Rolls, J. (2024). The transformational leader: The wellspring of the learning organization. In *Learning organizations* (pp. 101–110). Productivity Press.
- Rufus, A. I., Festus, A. F., & Dada, B. I. (2022). Intellectual capital and organisational performance of the financial sector: Evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Risk Management*, 7(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijafm.20220701.11>
- Saasongu, N. (2015). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance in small and medium scale enterprises (SMEs) in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Management & Business Studies*, 2(2), 23–30.
- Saxena, V. (2019). *Employee engagement: A recipe to boost organisational performance*. Notion Press.
- Schermuly, C. C., Creon, L., Gerlach, P., Graßmann, C., & Koch, J. (2022). Leadership styles and psychological empowerment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 29(1), 73–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518211056380>
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Shafiu, A. M., Manaf, H. A., & Muslim, S. (2019). The impact of leadership on organizational performance. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(3), 7573–7576.
- Sharma, V. (2022). A pragmatic study on management with autocratic approach and consequential impact on profitability of the organization. In *Electronic Systems and Intelligent Computing: Proceedings of ESIC 2021* (pp. 121–130). Springer Nature Singapore.
- Shaw, S. (2022). Authoritarian leadership: Is democracy in peril? *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 48(9), 1247–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537221121260>
- Stanley, D. (2022). Leadership theories and styles. In *Clinical leadership in nursing and healthcare* (pp. 31–60). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sürücü, L., & Sağbaş, M. (2021). The impact of leadership styles on job satisfaction: A study of the hospitality industry. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 19(40), 323–346.
- Thanh, N. H., & Quang, N. V. (2022). Transformational, transactional, laissez-faire leadership styles and employee engagement: Evidence from Vietnam's public sector. *SAGE Open*, 12(2), 21582440221094606. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221094606>
- Ulrich, D., & Smallwood, N. (2012). What is leadership? In W. H. Mobley, Y. Wang, & M. Li (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 7, pp. 9–36). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Velarde, J. M. (2023). *Leading in multicultural schools: Cultural intelligence and leadership styles for better organisations*. Routledge.

- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.
- Wang, Q., Hou, H., & Li, Z. (2022). Participative leadership: A literature review and prospects for future research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 924357. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.924357>
- Yusuf-Habeeb, M., & Ibrahim, Y. (2017). Effects of leadership style on employee performance in Nigerian universities. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management, 17*(7), 26–33.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX I

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, NIGERIA

**Dear Respondent,**

#### **REQUEST FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

I am an undergraduate student of the above-named department and institution, currently conducting a research study titled: **“Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Selected Hotels in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria.”**

You have been carefully selected as part of the sample for this research. Kindly assist by taking a few minutes to complete this questionnaire as honestly as possible. Please be assured that your responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used strictly for academic purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation and valuable time.

Sincerely,

CHILAKA

MARY

EZINNE

Department

of

Business

Administration

University

of

Benin

Benin City, Nigeria

#### SECTION A: PERSONAL DATA

*(Please tick [√] the option that best represents your response.)*

1. **Gender:** Male [ ] Female [ ]
2. **Age Range (years):** Below 22 [ ] 22–26 [ ] 27–31 [ ] 32 and above [ ]

3. **Educational Qualification:** SSCE [ ] ND/NCE [ ] HND/B.Sc [ ] M.Sc and above [ ]
4. **Employment Position:** Manager [ ] Supervisor [ ] Front Desk Officer [ ] Other Staff [ ]
5. **Years of Experience in the Hotel Industry:** Less than 5 years [ ] 5–10 years [ ] Above 10 years [ ]

**SECTION B: LEADERSHIP STYLES AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE**

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by ticking (√) the appropriate box.

**Key:**

SA = Strongly Agree      A = Agree      U = Undecided      D = Disagree      SD = Strongly Disagree

**A. Organisational Performance (OP)**

S/N	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA
1	The hotel consistently achieves its stated goals and objectives.					
2	Employees in my hotel perform their duties effectively and efficiently.					
3	The level of customer satisfaction in this hotel is consistently high.					
4	The hotel’s operations run smoothly and productively.					
5	My hotel has maintained a positive reputation due to effective management and staff performance.					

**B. Transformational Leadership (TFL)**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>
6	My manager inspires employees to exceed normal performance expectations.					
7	My supervisor communicates a clear vision that motivates employees.					
8	I am encouraged to think creatively and contribute innovative ideas.					
9	My manager recognises and rewards outstanding employee performance.					
10	My manager supports my career growth and development.					

**C. Transactional Leadership (TSL)**

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>
11	My supervisor uses rewards to encourage good performance.					
12	I am held accountable for not meeting performance targets.					
13	Management clearly defines performance expectations.					
14	Feedback is given based on achievement of measurable goals.					

15	My performance is regularly evaluated to ensure compliance with organisational standards.					
----	---	--	--	--	--	--

***D. Laissez-Faire Leadership (LFL)***

S/N	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA
16	My manager allows employees to make decisions independently.					
17	I work with minimal supervision from my superior.					
18	Supervisors in my hotel rarely interfere in employees' tasks.					
19	I am expected to solve work-related problems on my own.					
20	My manager gives employees full autonomy in carrying out their duties.					

***E. Autocratic Leadership (ATL)***

S/N	Items	SD	D	U	A	SA
21	Decisions in my hotel are made solely by top management.					
22	Employees are expected to follow instructions without questioning.					
23	My manager rarely seeks employees' input before making decisions.					

24	Strict rules are enforced by management with little flexibility.					
25	Employee feedback is often ignored in my hotel.					

***F. Participative Leadership (PTL)***

<b>S/N</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>
26	My manager encourages team members to share their opinions.					
27	I feel that my ideas are valued during decision-making.					
28	Employees and managers collaborate to solve problems.					
29	Management involves staff in setting organisational goals.					
30	I am comfortable discussing work-related issues with my manager.					

**Thank you for your time and cooperation!**

Your contribution is highly appreciated and will significantly aid the successful completion of this academic research.

## APPENDIX II

NEW FILE.

DATASET NAME DataSet1 WINDOW=FRONT.

COMPUTE OP=MEAN (OP1,OP2,OP3,OP4,OP5).

EXECUTE.

COMPUTE TFL=MEAN (TFL1,TFL2,TFL3,TFL4,TFL5).

EXECUTE.

COMPUTE TSL=MEAN (TSL1,TSL2,TSL3,TSL4,TSL5).

EXECUTE.

COMPUTE LFL=MEAN (LFL1,LFL2,LFL3,LFL4,LFL5).

EXECUTE.

COMPUTE ATL=MEAN (ATL1,ATL2,ATL3,ATL4,ATL5).

EXECUTE.

COMPUTE PTL=MEAN (PTL1,PTL2,PTL3,PTL4,PTL5).

EXECUTE.

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=OP1 OP2 OP3 OP4 OP5 TFL1 TFL2 TFL3 TFL4 TFL5  
TSL1 TSL2 TSL3 TSL4 TSL5 LFL1 LFL2 LFL3 LFL4 LFL5 ATL1 ATL2 ATL3 ATL4  
ATL5 PTL1 PTL2 PTL3 PTL4 PTL5

/ORDER=ANALYSIS.

## Frequencies

### Notes

Output Created		06-NOV-2025 08:57:45
Comments		
Input	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	134
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data.
Syntax		<pre> FREQUENCIES  VARIABLES=OP1 OP2 OP3 OP4 OP5 TFL1 TFL2 TFL3 TFL4 TFL5 TSL1 TSL2 TSL3 TSL4 TSL5 LFL1 LFL2 LFL3 LFL4 LFL5 ATL1 ATL2 ATL3 ATL4 ATL5 PTL1 PTL2 PTL3 PTL4 PTL5  /ORDER=ANALYSIS. </pre>
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.08
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.09

## Frequency Table

**The hotel consistently achieves its stated goals and objectives.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	14	10.4	10.4	10.4
Disagree	15	11.2	11.2	21.6
Neutral	28	20.9	20.9	42.5
Agree	47	35.1	35.1	77.6
Strongly Agree	30	22.4	22.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Employees in my hotel perform their duties effectively and efficiently.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	10	7.5	7.5	7.5
Disagree	17	12.7	12.7	20.1
Neutral	28	20.9	20.9	41.0
Agree	52	38.8	38.8	79.9
Strongly Agree	27	20.1	20.1	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**The level of customer satisfaction in this hotel is consistently high.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	16	11.9	11.9	11.9
Disagree	12	9.0	9.0	20.9
Neutral	30	22.4	22.4	43.3
Agree	50	37.3	37.3	80.6
Strongly Agree	26	19.4	19.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**The hotel's operations run smoothly and productively.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
Disagree	23	17.2	17.2	23.1
Neutral	27	20.1	20.1	43.3
Agree	49	36.6	36.6	79.9
Strongly Agree	27	20.1	20.1	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My hotel has maintained a positive reputation due to effective management and staff performance.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	15	11.2	11.2	11.2
Disagree	18	13.4	13.4	24.6
Neutral	25	18.7	18.7	43.3
Agree	45	33.6	33.6	76.9
Strongly Agree	31	23.1	23.1	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My manager inspires employees to exceed normal performance expectations.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	14	10.4	10.4	10.4
Disagree	14	10.4	10.4	20.9
Neutral	25	18.7	18.7	39.6
Agree	50	37.3	37.3	76.9
Strongly Agree	31	23.1	23.1	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My supervisor communicates a clear vision that motivates employees.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
Disagree	12	9.0	9.0	14.2
Neutral	33	24.6	24.6	38.8
Agree	56	41.8	41.8	80.6
Strongly Agree	26	19.4	19.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**I am encouraged to think creatively and contribute innovative ideas.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
Disagree	10	7.5	7.5	13.4
Neutral	30	22.4	22.4	35.8
Agree	60	44.8	44.8	80.6
Strongly Agree	26	19.4	19.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My manager recognises and rewards outstanding employee performance.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	10	7.5	7.5	7.5
Disagree	15	11.2	11.2	18.7
Neutral	35	26.1	26.1	44.8
Agree	43	32.1	32.1	76.9
Strongly Agree	31	23.1	23.1	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My manager supports my career growth and development.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	6.7	6.7	6.7
Disagree	17	12.7	12.7	19.4
Neutral	35	26.1	26.1	45.5
Agree	43	32.1	32.1	77.6
Strongly Agree	30	22.4	22.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My supervisor uses rewards to encourage good performance.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	12	9.0	9.0	9.0
Disagree	12	9.0	9.0	17.9
Neutral	32	23.9	23.9	41.8
Agree	48	35.8	35.8	77.6
Strongly Agree	30	22.4	22.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**I am held accountable for not meeting performance targets.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	10	7.5	7.5	7.5
Disagree	16	11.9	11.9	19.4
Neutral	29	21.6	21.6	41.0
Agree	53	39.6	39.6	80.6
Strongly Agree	26	19.4	19.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Management clearly defines performance expectations.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
Disagree	9	6.7	6.7	12.7
Neutral	33	24.6	24.6	37.3
Agree	52	38.8	38.8	76.1
Strongly Agree	32	23.9	23.9	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Feedback is given based on achievement of measurable goals.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
Disagree	17	12.7	12.7	18.7
Neutral	27	20.1	20.1	38.8
Agree	44	32.8	32.8	71.6
Strongly Agree	38	28.4	28.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My performance is regularly evaluated to ensure compliance with organisational standards.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	10	7.5	7.5	7.5
Disagree	13	9.7	9.7	17.2
Neutral	28	20.9	20.9	38.1
Agree	55	41.0	41.0	79.1
Strongly Agree	28	20.9	20.9	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My manager allows employees to make decisions independently.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	13	9.7	9.7	9.7
Disagree	24	17.9	17.9	27.6
Neutral	35	26.1	26.1	53.7
Agree	34	25.4	25.4	79.1
Strongly Agree	28	20.9	20.9	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**I work with minimal supervision from my superior.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Disagree	20	14.9	14.9	19.4
Neutral	37	27.6	27.6	47.0
Agree	36	26.9	26.9	73.9
Strongly Agree	35	26.1	26.1	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Supervisors in my hotel rarely interfere in employees' tasks.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
Disagree	24	17.9	17.9	23.9
Neutral	33	24.6	24.6	48.5
Agree	41	30.6	30.6	79.1
Strongly Agree	28	20.9	20.9	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**I am expected to solve work-related problems on my own.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	11	8.2	8.2	8.2
Disagree	21	15.7	15.7	23.9
Neutral	29	21.6	21.6	45.5
Agree	41	30.6	30.6	76.1
Strongly Agree	32	23.9	23.9	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My manager gives employees full autonomy in carrying out their duties.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	6.7	6.7	6.7
Disagree	18	13.4	13.4	20.1
Neutral	33	24.6	24.6	44.8
Agree	47	35.1	35.1	79.9
Strongly Agree	27	20.1	20.1	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Decisions in my hotel are made solely by top management.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Disagree	13	9.7	9.7	14.2
Neutral	28	20.9	20.9	35.1
Agree	54	40.3	40.3	75.4
Strongly Agree	33	24.6	24.6	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Employees are expected to follow instructions without questioning.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	6.7	6.7	6.7
Disagree	14	10.4	10.4	17.2
Neutral	36	26.9	26.9	44.0
Agree	45	33.6	33.6	77.6
Strongly Agree	30	22.4	22.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My manager rarely seeks employees' input before making decisions.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	6.7	6.7	6.7
Disagree	15	11.2	11.2	17.9
Neutral	38	28.4	28.4	46.3
Agree	40	29.9	29.9	76.1
Strongly Agree	32	23.9	23.9	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Strict rules are enforced by management with little flexibility.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	6.7	6.7	6.7
Disagree	17	12.7	12.7	19.4
Neutral	27	20.1	20.1	39.6
Agree	52	38.8	38.8	78.4
Strongly Agree	29	21.6	21.6	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Employee feedback is often ignored in my hotel.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	5	3.7	3.7	3.7
Disagree	19	14.2	14.2	17.9
Neutral	35	26.1	26.1	44.0
Agree	49	36.6	36.6	80.6
Strongly Agree	26	19.4	19.4	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**My manager encourages team members to share their opinions.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
Disagree	14	10.4	10.4	16.4
Neutral	27	20.1	20.1	36.6
Agree	57	42.5	42.5	79.1
Strongly Agree	28	20.9	20.9	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**I feel that my ideas are valued during decision-making.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
Disagree	11	8.2	8.2	11.2
Neutral	38	28.4	28.4	39.6
Agree	48	35.8	35.8	75.4
Strongly Agree	33	24.6	24.6	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Employees and managers collaborate to solve problems.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	6.0	6.0	6.0
Disagree	10	7.5	7.5	13.4
Neutral	25	18.7	18.7	32.1
Agree	56	41.8	41.8	73.9
Strongly Agree	35	26.1	26.1	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**Management involves staff in setting organisational goals.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
Disagree	11	8.2	8.2	13.4
Neutral	37	27.6	27.6	41.0
Agree	50	37.3	37.3	78.4
Strongly Agree	29	21.6	21.6	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

**I am comfortable discussing work-related issues with my manager.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	11	8.2	8.2	8.2
Disagree	13	9.7	9.7	17.9
Neutral	33	24.6	24.6	42.5
Agree	56	41.8	41.8	84.3
Strongly Agree	21	15.7	15.7	100.0
Total	134	100.0	100.0	

DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=OP1 OP2 OP3 OP4 OP5 TFL1 TFL2 TFL3 TFL4 TFL5  
 TSL1 TSL2 TSL3 TSL4 TSL5 LFL1 LFL2 LFL3 LFL4 LFL5 ATL1 ATL2 ATL3 ATL4  
 ATL5 PTL1 PTL2 PTL3 PTL4 PTL5 OP TFL TSL LFL ATL PTL

/STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.

## Descriptives

### Notes

Output Created		06-NOV-2025 08:58:00
Comments		
Input	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	134
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	All non-missing data are used.
Syntax		DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=OP1 OP2 OP3 OP4 OP5 TFL1 TFL2 TFL3 TFL4 TFL5 TSL1 TSL2 TSL3 TSL4 TSL5 LFL1 LFL2 LFL3 LFL4 LFL5 ATL1 ATL2 ATL3 ATL4 ATL5 PTL1 PTL2 PTL3 PTL4 PTL5 OP TFL TSL LFL ATL PTL  /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

## Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The hotel consistently achieves its stated goals and objectives.	134	1.00	5.00	3.4776	1.24886
Employees in my hotel perform their duties effectively and efficiently.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5149	1.16809
The level of customer satisfaction in this hotel is consistently high.	134	1.00	5.00	3.4328	1.24120
The hotel's operations run smoothly and productively.	134	1.00	5.00	3.4776	1.16797
My hotel has maintained a positive reputation due to effective management and staff performance.	134	1.00	5.00	3.4403	1.28912
My manager inspires employees to exceed normal performance expectations.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5224	1.24886
My supervisor communicates a clear vision that motivates employees.	134	1.00	5.00	3.6119	1.06135
I am encouraged to think creatively and contribute innovative ideas.	134	1.00	5.00	3.6418	1.06484
My manager recognises and rewards outstanding employee performance.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5224	1.18078
My manager supports my career growth and development.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5075	1.16816

My supervisor uses rewards to encourage good performance.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5373	1.19307
I am held accountable for not meeting performance targets.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5149	1.15515
Management clearly defines performance expectations.	134	1.00	5.00	3.6791	1.09408
Feedback is given based on achievement of measurable goals.	134	1.00	5.00	3.6493	1.19055
My performance is regularly evaluated to ensure compliance with organisational standards.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5821	1.14576
My manager allows employees to make decisions independently.	134	1.00	5.00	3.2985	1.25674
I work with minimal supervision from my superior.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5522	1.16055
Supervisors in my hotel rarely interfere in employees' tasks.	134	1.00	5.00	3.4254	1.17861
I am expected to solve work-related problems on my own.	134	1.00	5.00	3.4627	1.24246
My manager gives employees full autonomy in carrying out their duties.	134	1.00	5.00	3.4851	1.15515
Decisions in my hotel are made solely by top management.	134	1.00	5.00	3.7090	1.08180
Employees are expected to follow instructions without questioning.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5448	1.14784

My manager rarely seeks employees' input before making decisions.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5299	1.16780
Strict rules are enforced by management with little flexibility.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5597	1.16019
Employee feedback is often ignored in my hotel.	134	1.00	5.00	3.5373	1.07365
My manager encourages team members to share their opinions.	134	1.00	5.00	3.6194	1.10905
I feel that my ideas are valued during decision-making.	134	1.00	5.00	3.7090	1.02469
Employees and managers collaborate to solve problems.	134	1.00	5.00	3.7463	1.10832
Management involves staff in setting organisational goals.	134	1.00	5.00	3.6194	1.07462
I am comfortable discussing work-related issues with my manager.	134	1.00	5.00	3.4701	1.12183
OP	134	1.00	5.00	3.4687	.98595
TFL	134	1.00	5.00	3.5612	.89223
TSL	134	1.00	5.00	3.5925	.92952
LFL	134	1.20	5.00	3.4448	.92700
ATL	134	1.00	5.00	3.5761	.86435
PTL	134	1.00	5.00	3.6328	.83682
Valid N (listwise)	134				

CORRELATIONS

/VARIABLES=OP TFL TSL LFL ATL PTL

/PRINT=ONETAIL NOSIG

/MISSING=PAIRWISE.

**Correlations**

**Notes**

Output Created		06-NOV-2025 08:58:24
Comments		
Input	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	134
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with valid data for that pair.
Syntax		CORRELATIONS  /VARIABLES=OP TFL TSL LFL ATL PTL  /PRINT=ONETAIL NOSIG  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02

## Correlations

		OP	TFL	TSL	LFL	ATL	PTL
OP	Pearson Correlation	1	.751**	.681**	.493**	.408**	.562**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
TFL	Pearson Correlation	.751**	1	.761**	.542**	.417**	.636**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
TSL	Pearson Correlation	.681**	.761**	1	.582**	.540**	.570**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
LFL	Pearson Correlation	.493**	.542**	.582**	1	.583**	.633**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
ATL	Pearson Correlation	.408**	.417**	.540**	.583**	1	.475**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134
PTL	Pearson Correlation	.562**	.636**	.570**	.633**	.475**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	134	134	134	134	134	134

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

## REGRESSION

/MISSING LISTWISE

/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS CI(95) R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE

/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

/NOORIGIN

/DEPENDENT OP

/METHOD=ENTER TFL TSL LFL ATL PTL

/RESIDUALS DURBIN.

## Regression

### Notes

Output Created		06-NOV-2025 08:59:01
Comments		
Input	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	134
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used.

Syntax		REGRESSION  /MISSING LISTWISE  /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS CI(95) R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE  /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  /NOORIGIN  /DEPENDENT OP  /METHOD=ENTER TFL TSL LFL ATL PTL  /RESIDUALS DURBIN.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.04
	Memory Required	6000 bytes
	Additional Memory Required for Residual Plots	0 bytes

### Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	PTL, ATL, TSL, LFL, TFL <sup>b</sup>	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: OP

b. All requested variables entered.

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics	
					R Square Change	F Change
1	.775 <sup>a</sup>	.600	.584	.63569	.600	38.388

a. Predictors: (Constant), PTL, ATL, TSL, LFL, TFL

b. Dependent Variable: OP

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	77.563	5	15.513	38.388	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	51.725	128	.404		
	Total	129.288	133			

a. Dependent Variable: OP

b. Predictors: (Constant), PTL, ATL, TSL, LFL, TFL

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.081	.286		.284	.777
	TFL	.558	.103	.505	5.393	.000
	TSL	.234	.100	.220	2.335	.021
	LFL	.021	.087	.020	.241	.810
	ATL	.028	.083	.025	.337	.736
	PTL	.107	.096	.091	1.118	.266

a. Dependent Variable: OP

**Collinearity Diagnostics<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions					
				(Constant)	TFL	TSL	LFL	ATL	PTL
1	1	5.867	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	2	.040	12.115	.17	.17	.11	.02	.22	.00
	3	.034	13.059	.54	.02	.00	.38	.05	.00
	4	.028	14.548	.03	.00	.16	.16	.40	.25
	5	.018	17.865	.26	.00	.05	.42	.23	.57
	6	.012	21.801	.01	.81	.67	.02	.10	.18

a. Dependent Variable: OP

**Residuals Statistics<sup>a</sup>**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	1.0329	4.8190	3.4687	.76366	134
Residual	-1.74317	1.98056	.00000	.62363	134
Std. Predicted Value	-3.190	1.768	.000	1.000	134
Std. Residual	-2.742	3.116	.000	.981	134

a. Dependent Variable: OP