

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Satisfaction in Selected Banks in Ghana

Isaac Boakye

Lecturer, University of Applied Management, Ghana Campus, Accra, Ghana

Simon Owusu Boahen

Business Intelligence Officer, UMB Centre for Business, Accra, Ghana

Abstract:

Literature and practice have shown that leaders play a key role in determining the behavioral outcomes of employees who are the main drivers of the vision and goals of their superiors. The study sought to ascertain the effect of leadership style on employee satisfaction using the banking sector of Ghana as the study case. Using the quantitative approach, the descriptive design was used to describe the effect of the three dominant leadership styles mainly the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership on employee satisfaction. Data was collected using standardized questionnaires from 180 leaders and their corresponding subordinates who were selected using the purposive and simple random respectively. The study employed the hierarchical regression to control for demographic variables such as age, gender, level of education, marital status, years of experience and number of children employees have on the effect of leadership styles on employee satisfaction. Furthermore, the study also perused whether there was a difference in leadership style due to the gender of leaders, this enquiry was ascertained using the independent sample t-test. The findings of the study revealed that after controlling for all the demographic factors, transformational leadership style has the most variance in employee satisfaction. On the other hand, as observed from literature, there was no significant difference in leadership style due to gender of leaders. The study recommended that organization develop effective programs for both leaders and potential leaders on transformational thinking, besides, organizations should also adopt thinking walls which will be used for communicating transformational values in the organization.

Keywords: Leadership style, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, Laissez-Faire leadership, employee Satisfaction

1. Introduction

Leadership as a concept was originally developed in folk psychology to explain social influence on groups (Creswell, 2005). Very simply put, a leader is interpreted as someone who sets direction in an effort and influences people to follow that direction. Leadership can be described as a process where a leader directs and synthesizes the efforts of a group towards the establishment of a defined goal (Aaker, Kumer, Day, 2012). Therefore, leadership is the ability to influence a group towards the achievement of goals. The avenue through which the leader influences the subordinates may be formal where he is considered as a figure head or a father of a sort for which reason he is listened to or an informal one where an individual indirectly influences a group. The informal structure of leadership is as important if leadership is the result of the interaction among leaders, the followers and the leadership situation. The leadership process contains all these elements. Leadership generally is regarded as essential to group and organizational effectiveness. Thus, leadership contributes significantly in the success and failure of organization. It tends to be based on position, authority and seniority; for example, commitment is highly associated with loyalty to the top boss in China (Aryeetey, 2010). Effective leadership in organization, therefore, creates vision of the future that considers the legitimate long term interest of the parties involved in the organization to develop a strategy for moving forward towards that vision enlists the support of employees to produce the movement and motivates employees to implement the strategy.

Creswell (2005) characterized representative occupation satisfaction as the level of satisfaction of worker needs, needs and yearning. Worker satisfaction is characterized as the blend of full of feeling responses to the differential view of what a representative need to get contrasted and what he or she really gets (Baer, 2014). As indicated by Alanzi (2010) worker satisfaction characterizes how content a representative is with his or her position of business. Becker (2009) watched that representative occupation satisfaction is the emotions that an individual has about his/her employment and its different angles. Worker satisfaction is a complete term that includes work satisfaction of representatives and their satisfaction general

with companies" strategies, organization environment and so on. All things considered, it is the measure of how glad, fought and satisfying representatives are with their employment and working milieu. Satisfaction fundamentally relies on what an individual need from the world, and what he gets. Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (2007) set that powerful associations have a culture that supports worker work satisfaction. Ponders have demonstrated that fulfilled representatives will probably work harder and give better administrations to their association (Bolger, 2001; Brown, 2003) This recommend workers who are happy with their occupation have a tendency to be more included and submitted in their utilizing associations, and more devoted to conveying administrations with an abnormal state of value. As needs be, Sharma, Jain and Bakirov (2013) expressed that workers are more profitable and steadfast when they are fulfilled and these representative satisfactions tend to impact consumer loyalty and hierarchical efficiency (Crawford, 2014).

There is no restriction for the representatives to achieve the full satisfaction and it might fluctuate from worker to worker. Here and there they have to change their practices keeping in mind the end goal to execute their obligations all the more viably to increase more noteworthy occupation satisfaction (Dansereau, 2004). Having great associations with the partners, high compensation (i.e. pay), great working conditions, preparing and instruction openings, vocation improvements, professional stability, great correspondence amongst administration and representatives and great connection amongst worker and prompt boss or whatever other advantages identified with expanding worker satisfaction are the foundation of proficient and viable profitability (Ejimifor, 2012). Eswaran, Islam and Muhd (2011) partitioned work satisfaction into five measurements: pay, advancements and preparing openings, colleagues, supervisions, and the work itself. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) additionally utilized the five measurements to gauge work satisfaction. The precision of foreseeing occupation satisfaction from interests is influenced by the inclination to utilize an in general or worldwide satisfaction score.

Grant and Cashman (2012) recommended that more fulfilled representative invigorates the chain of positive activities which come full circle into an enhanced authoritative execution. Consequently, leaders, CEOs, executives and maintenance specialists to HR needs to understand representative unwaveringness and satisfaction - how dedicated is the workforce to the association and if laborers are truly mollified with the method for things for gaging their probability to remain with the organization. One of the fundamental parts of Human Resource Management is the estimation of worker satisfaction. Organizations need to ensure that representative satisfaction is high among the laborers, which is a precondition for expanding profitability, responsiveness and quality client benefit. As studies have demonstrated that enterprises that exceed expectations in worker satisfaction issues lessen turnover by half from the standards, increment consumer loyalty to a normal of 95 % and lower work cost by 12% (Aryetey, 2010).

An association that encourages high worker work satisfaction is likewise more fit for holding and pulling in representatives with the aptitudes that it needs (Graen & Casman, 2015). Representative occupation satisfaction has turned into a vital corporate goal as of late and leader's authority style in administration is a basic deciding component in the achievement of an association in fulfilling workers. That is leader's administration styles affect the way leaders relate, think, feel, see and react to other individuals (Hulin, 2001;Ejimifor, 2012). Work satisfaction alludes to the genuine sentiments of a representative towards his work execution. Among all the diverse components that have an impact on representative occupation satisfaction, leader's leadership styles have been viewed as a standout amongst the most essential. Various reviews completed in different nations presumed that there is a positive connection between leader's authority styles and workers' occupation satisfaction (Grant & Cashman, 2012). By and large individuals leave their supervisors not their employments, when they change starting with one association then onto the next. As a rule, when individuals enter a position in an association, a representative has the desire of coexisting with his or her leader and the two builds up a working relationship (Kennerly, 2005). Issues create when a representative start encountering troublesome communications with his or her leader, which causes the worker to feel unworthy to play out his or her occupation work after some time (Boahen, 2015). In a review performed by Hittleman and associates, the group observed that workers created expectations to leave their positions in light of the fact that the leader was not steady, demonstrated preference to different representatives, was hard to interface with and had given the representative an inclination that they had accomplished something incorrectly or are unworthy which is a demonstration of manager disappointment. In such circumstances, the worker likewise gets to be distinctly disappointed because of his or her supervisor leadership style showed.

2.Statement of the Problem

It is an open secret that the cry of employees has been preached in the last decade. This is evident in the myriads of studies conducted in the field of leadership and employee outcomes alone. In Ghana, the employee association have come out lament on several issues of dissatisfaction o=based on the behaviors of leaders in several organizations. In the field of leadership, most scholars have dwelt on how the leader's behavior affects employees in various ways (Simon, 2015; Grant & Cashman, 2012), others have also concentrated on the relationship between leaders and subordinates and how it has influence the latter's behavior (Kiboss,&Jemiryott, 2014). The current study seeks to contribute to literature by assessing the role demographic characteristics of subordinates play in the relationship between leaders and the response behavior of their subordinates.

3. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to assess the effect of leadership style on employee satisfaction, however, the specific objectives are to:

- a. Examine the effect of the individual leadership styles on employee satisfaction.
- b. Ascertain whether there is a difference in leadership style due to gender of leaders.

4. Methodology

The study predominantly was approached quantitatively. Quantitative research approach is characterized by tables and graphs as a medium of presenting data collected from respondents. Quantitative researchers believe that the best way of measuring the properties of a phenomenon (e.g. the attitude of individual towards certain topics) is through quantitative measurements, because quantification makes the observation more explicit (Meyer, Katz, Fisher, & Notrica, 2002). Aaker, Kumar and Day (2001), highlighted that a research design serves as the blueprint that guides or shapes the way a researcher goes about a research project. The study employed the cross sectional design. Thus, data was taken at a specific point in time for the purposes of the study. Furthermore, the descriptive design was also employed to explain the views of respondents with respect to the research objectives.

5. Population and Sampling

The population of the study comprised all the banks in Ghana. Out of these, the study selected 10 banks who are listed on the Ghana stock exchange. The banks were selected using the convenient sampling method. Furthermore, out of these banks, 80 subordinates were selected using the simple random sampling whiles their corresponding supervisors or leaders were also chosen using the purposive sampling. Thus in all, 160 participants were targeted for the study. The sample size for the study meets the minimum sample size as prescribed by Tabachnick and Fidel (2007) who opined that for a study that seeks to use regression analysis should have a sample size of not less than the function "50+8M" where "M" stands for the number of independent variables in the study. The current study has 3 independent variables (transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership), hence the minimum sample size ought not be less than 74, therefore, a sample of 160 outweighs the minimum requirement.

6. Instrumentation

The study employed the widely used Multifactor leadership scale developed by Bass and Avolio (1990) to identify the leadership style of the various branch managers. The instrument as the name connotes is a scale that measures diverse leadership styles including transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership style. It is a 45-itemized questionnaire that is rated from 0 to 4. Thus, 0 being "Not at all" to 4 which is interpreted as "Frequently, if not always". On the other hand, this study used the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) by Spector (1994) to gather data about the respondents' level of satisfaction on their jobs. An instrument widely used in determining the level of employee satisfaction. This is a 10-item instrument that is self-rated with scores from 10 to 50. Sample items in the employee satisfaction questionnaire includes "I get along with my supervisors". The JSQ uses a Likert-type response format with each item presenting the respondent with five response options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The JSQ uses a Likert-type response format with each item presenting the respondent with five response options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

6.1. Validity of Study Instrument: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Although research in the area of leadership style, employee satisfaction and employee commitment in Ghana have been done relating to other fields, most of such studies used their own measures whiles others used other standard questionnaires Tabachnick and Fidel (2007). The researcher therefore intended to assess the overall fitness of the study instruments by way of a construct validity since some of the instruments (employee satisfaction scale) used were new in this setting (Ghana). Most of the studies on leadership style and employee outcomes employed different self-developed instruments. Although the instruments used in this study are standard questionnaires, the researcher did some adjustments to some of them to suit the respondents. For instance, in the leadership scale questionnaire, "my leader" was replaced with "I" in order to enable the leaders respond to the question appropriately. The confirmatory factor analysis was examined based on three indexes. These indexes are: (1) testing the fit goodness of chi-square (χ^2); the ratio of the degree of freedom (χ^2/df); (2) root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA); and (3) goodness of fit index (GFI). Table 1 presents a description of these indices and suggested cut-offs.

Index	Description	Cut-Offs
(χ^2/df)	Because the chi-square test is sensitive to sample size and is only meaningful if the degrees of freedom are taken into account, its value is divided by the number of degrees of freedom	1-2or1-3
RMSEA	Show how well the model fits the population covariance matrix, taken the number of degrees of freedom into consideration	Must be Less than 0.08
CFI	Show how much better the model fits, compared to a baseline model, normally the null model, adjusted for the degrees of freedom	Must be Greater than 0.90

Table 1: Descriptions and Thresholds of Goodness-of-Fit

Source: Erben and Güneser (2009), Diaz-Saenz, (2011), Dulebohn et al. (2011), Alanzi (2010)

Table 2 below show the summary of the results of the factor solution for the three variables [Leadership Style (LS), Employee Job Satisfaction (ES)].

Fitness Measures		CFA-LS		CFA-ES	
N		160		160	
CFI		0.94		0.97	
RMSEA		0.04		0.07	
(χ^2/df)		1.41		1.21	

Table 2: Validity Models for Three Variables

Source: Survey data, 2017

Note - LS: Leadership style, ES: Employee Job Satisfaction, CFI- Confirmatory Factor Index RMSEA- Root Mean Square Error of Approximation

6.2. Multicollinearity of Study Variables

One of the critical assumptions that must be met for a regression analysis to be done is the multicollinearity assumption. This assumption posits that for a regression model to be valid, in a case where there are two or more predictor variables, those variables must not be highly correlated, that is, the relationship between those two variables must not be too high otherwise they are capable of replacing each other or affecting the results of the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). This study has three predictor variables (transformational leadership, transactional leadership and Laissez-faire leadership). Scholars have proposed that although the correlation matrix table is one of the ways of assessing the multicollinearity of a set of predictor variables, a more robust analysis would be that of the Tolerance and Variance Inflation factor. Using this rule, the VIF is supposed to be less than 10. The output table below indicates that for all the predictor variables (Transactional leadership, transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership) the VIF was below 10, hence this assumption was not violated.

Coefficients								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-0.047	0.318		-0.149	0.882		
	Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.191	0.100	0.185	1.919	0.059	0.695	1.439
	Transactional leadership	-0.016	0.020	-0.108	-0.805	0.423	0.360	2.774
	Transformational leadership	0.189	0.041	0.678	4.652	0.000	0.304	3.288

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Satisfaction

Table 3: Multicollinearity of Leadership Style and Employee Satisfaction

Source: Survey data, 2017

7. Analysis and Findings

7.1. Demographic Information of Respondents

Data collected from the respondents affirmed that a majority of the respondents were males (103, 57.2%) as compared to females (77, 42.8%). On the other hand, most of the respondents were between the ages of 36 to 40 years (93, 51.67%). Furthermore, a majority of the respondents had attained a maximum of an undergraduate degree (83, 46.1%).

Respondents who had married had a frequency of 111 (61.67%). This appeared to be the modal mark in terms of the marital status of the respondents. Besides, most of the respondents have been with their organizations for a period of between 1 to 5 years (91, 50.56%). In terms of the number of children respondents had, most of the sampled respondents had at least one child.

7.2. Leadership Style and Employee Satisfaction

In order to ascertain the effect of leadership style on employee satisfaction, a hierarchical regression was employed. This type of analysis was employed because the researcher intended to assess the effect of leadership style variables (Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire) on employee job satisfaction (Boahen, 2015). Table 3 reveals that transactional leadership had as low as a 0.5% variance on employee job satisfaction (R^2 change= 0.005), in line with a meta-analysis by Korb (2013), transactional leadership was not significantly related to the employee job satisfaction construct. On the other hand, transformational leadership contributed a variance of 48.1% (R^2 change= 0.481), to the employee job satisfaction construct. This was found to be very significant. Finally, Laissez-Faire leadership was very minimal in predicting employee job satisfaction although the relationship was significant (R^2 change= 0.024) that represent a contribution of 2.4% variance. Spector (2009) suggest that transformational leadership can be used to raise organizational commitment and employees' satisfaction. McMillan and Schumacher(2006) posited that transformational leadership style influence the passion with which people work towards achieving goals. Kiboss and Jemiryott (2014) postulates that transformational leadership styles influence teacher's job satisfaction towards perceptions of occupations with regard to factors such as professional growth, respect, self-efficacy, and school involvement especially in decisions that directly affect their work.

Transformational leadership has been observed to have an enormous impact on several employee outcomes. Boahen (2015) found that transformational leadership style had large influence on followers' performance and innovation and more significantly is associated with team cohesiveness, work unit effectiveness and organizational learning. Bogler (2001) established that leaders' transformational leadership style influenced the way subordinates enjoy their work in two ways; directly and indirectly. Aryeteey (2010) study findings indicated a positive association between transformational behaviours and sales performance, organizational citizenship behaviour; and impact on ingenuity at the two levels, personal and organizational levels (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Research finding of Kennerly (2005) unequivocally show that transformational leadership describes workers' opinion concerning an enabling and group centered leadership skills of a manager particularly where leaders' preoccupation is just about reward and punishment but then again consider their individual concerns before acting. Efforts made by subordinates under transformational leader are high and more committed to work (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). This goes to prove a strong support for hypothesis three. A summary of the analysis has been tabulated below:

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.693 ^a	0.481	0.474	0.86537	0.481	72.212	1	78	0.000
2	0.697 ^b	0.486	0.473	0.86664	0.005	0.770	1	77	0.383
3	0.714 ^c	0.510	0.490	0.85194	0.024	3.681	1	76	0.050
a. Predictors: (Constant), Transformational leadership									
b. Predictors: (Constant), Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership									
c. Predictors: (Constant), Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership, Laissez-Faire Leadership									
d. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction									

Table 4: Hierarchical Regression of Leadership Style on Employee Job Satisfaction

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.133	0.310		0.430	0.669
	Transformational leadership	0.193	0.023	0.693	8.498	0.000
2	(Constant)	0.080	0.317		0.251	0.802
	Transformational leadership	0.220	0.038	0.789	5.801	0.000
	Transactional leadership	-0.018	0.021	-0.119	-0.878	0.383
3	(Constant)	-0.047	0.318		-0.149	0.882
	Transformational leadership	0.189	0.041	0.678	4.652	0.000
	Transactional leadership	-0.016	0.020	-0.108	-0.805	0.423
	Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.191	0.100	0.185	1.919	0.050
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction						

Source: Survey data, 2017

7.3. Controlling for the Effects of Demographic Variables on the Relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Job Satisfaction

Furthermore, the study sought to establish the effects of the leadership style variables on employee job satisfaction after controlling for demographic variables such as age, gender, level of education, marital status and number of children. This was employed in order to ascertain the effect of the demographic variables on employee satisfaction as well as examining the effect of the leadership dimensions on employee satisfaction. According to Table 5 below, it is evident that demographic variables such as marital status and number of children were significant in determining their level of satisfaction on the job ($\beta = -0.257, p=0.006$) and ($\beta = 0.202, p=0.032$) respectively. But being married was negatively related to Job satisfaction and this could be explained to be the high demands married individuals have from their organizations due to the family pressure and hence demands cannot be easily met leading to dissatisfaction. On the other hand, demographics such as age and level of education were not significant in determining the level of satisfaction of employees on the job. Furthermore, the gender was also not significant to employee job satisfaction. With reference to leadership styles, it was revealed that after controlling for all the demographic variables, only transformational and Laissez-faire leadership were significant in determining the level of job satisfaction of employees ($\beta = 0.748, p=0.000$) and ($\beta = 0.262, p=0.013$) respectively. The overall model was significant contributing 46.9% to the employee satisfaction construct.

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.565 ^a	0.320	0.264	1.02383	0.320	5.719	6	73	0.000
2	0.784 ^b	0.614	0.564	0.78765	0.294	17.781	3	70	0.000
a. Predictors: (Constant), Number of children, Age, Gender, Marital, Level of education, Level of experience									
b. Predictors: (Constant), Number of children, Age, Gender, Marital, Level of education, Level of experience, Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership, Laissez-Faire Leadership,									
c. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction									

Table 5: Hierarchical Regression of Leaders Leadership style on Employee Job Satisfaction Controlling for Demographics

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.235	1.060		3.994	0.000
	Marital Status	-1.193	0.290	-0.455	-4.107	0.000
	Age	-0.006	0.112	-0.006	-.057	0.955
	Level of education	0.043	0.141	0.036	.303	0.763
	Gender	-0.064	0.102	-0.063	-.626	0.533
	Level of Experience	0.356	0.183	0.253	1.939	0.056
	Number of children	-0.238	0.290	-0.097	-.820	0.415
2	(Constant)	2.585	0.859		3.009	0.004
	Marital Status	-0.674	0.237	-0.257	-2.840	0.006
	Age	0.018	0.087	0.018	0.210	0.835
	Level of education	-0.221	0.116	-0.187	-1.908	0.061
	Gender	-0.075	0.079	-0.073	-0.946	0.347
	Level of Experience	-0.029	0.161	-0.020	-0.179	0.859
	Number of children	-0.494	0.226	-0.202	-2.182	0.032
	Transformational leadership	0.208	0.041	0.748	5.028	0.000
	Transactional leadership	-0.023	0.020	-0.149	-1.151	0.254
Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.271	0.106	0.262	2.562	0.013	
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Job Satisfaction						

Source: Survey data, 2017

7.4. Gender and Leadership Style

The final research question of the study sought to assess whether there was a difference in leadership style due to the gender of leaders. To assess this, the study employed the use of independent sample t-test where leadership style was entered as the testing variable and gender was entered as a group after a dummy coding of 0 and 1 was done to allow for the analysis. The results of the analysis have been tabulated below:

Independent Samples Test							
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Leadership summation	Equal variances assumed	0.049	0.826	-0.305	78	0.761	-1.69088
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.301	48.078	0.764	-1.69088

Table 6: Independent Sample T-Test on Leaders Gender

Group Statistics					
	Gender of Leader	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Leadership summation	Female	52	58.9630	23.00202	3.13018
	Male	28	60.6538	23.73848	4.65550

*p is not significant @ 0.05 level of significance

From the output Table 6 it can be inferred that there is no statistically significant difference in the leadership style ($t_{(78)} = -0.305$, $p > 0.05$) of male leaders, ($M = 60.653$, $SD = 4.65550$) and female leaders ($M = 58.9630$, $SD = 3.13018$). That is, there is not enough statistical evidence to conclude that there is a difference in leadership style due to the gender of leaders. Hence, hypothesis four is supported.

8. Discussion of Results

On the effect of leaders' leadership style on employee job satisfaction after controlling for level of education, age, gender, experience, number of children and marital status, it appeared that only transformational and Laissez-Faire leadership was significant to predicting employee satisfaction. On the other hand, demographic variables such as marital status and number of children were significant to employee job satisfaction. This has been supported by Hulin (2001), who observed that besides leadership style, other demographics play a major role in determining employee outcomes. They also emphasized that if the character of the leader leaves much to be desired, it will call for employees to leave the organization to other work places where they can find solace. Graen and Casman (2015) found that reduced employee satisfaction, or intentions to quit a job has been found to be one of the best predictors of actual quitting. This has been corroborated by Feidler (2009) when they stated that that job withdrawal intentions are the strongest predictor of employee turnover behaviour and it most often occurs as a result of leader behaviour towards subordinate.

On the account of leadership and gender, the study revealed that the difference in leaders' gender could not impact on their leadership style despite the assertions by other researchers (Yukl, 2001). Gender can be very ambiguous to study as there are several males who tend to exhibit female characteristics and vice-versa. Zembylas and Papapastasiou (2004) argued that gender is a very daisy variable as there is a distinction between gender and sex, that is, gender refers to the physical makeup of an individual while sex refers to the biological construction of an individual, that is, there could be several individual who may be "man" but have some amount of female biological traits such as sympathy, love, care and affective communication, such a "man" will be better studied in terms of biological constituents rather than gender and vice versa.

9. Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that, when leaders exhibit transformational leadership behaviors, it impacts on the behavior of their employees towards the organization. Thus, leadership style of supervisors has enormous impact on the job satisfaction of their employees within the organization. Moreover, despite the effect of the three leadership variables (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership) on employee outcomes, transformational leadership brings out the most effect on employee job satisfaction. Besides, employee demographics such as their age, gender, number of children and level of education plays a huge role in determining the degree to which they will be committed to an organization. Thus, employee with higher number of children was found to show positive commitment towards the organization. Finally, the leadership style of supervisors is not necessarily determined by their gender as several situations may alter the style a particular leader operates in. Based on the findings of the study, some recommendations have been made to organizations with respect to leadership style and employee outcomes. To begin, organizations must not only recognize the impact of transformational behaviors but should also take steps towards that behavior in their leaders. To do this, there is the need to organize leadership programmes every quarter of the year to train their leaders and employees under mentorship about some transformational behaviors of leaders in order to result in more employee improved outcomes. Moreover, organizations should also take note of the kind or traits they seek in people they are either promoting to leadership positions or recruiting as leaders. That is, aptitude tests should be geared towards asking questions that elicit the leadership composition in the individual. Such questions must cover such areas as transactional and transformational traits. Furthermore, there is the need, based on the findings of the study, for organizations to raise "thinking walls" where quotes and discussions about transformational leadership behaviors will be mounted in order to help achieve a more integrated mode of communication towards transformational leadership behaviors. Awards and motivations in the form of public praise could

also be exhibited towards supervisors who exhibit such behaviors in their field of work. This will help to motivate others to do same.

10. References

- i. Aaker, G., Kumer, E.T., Day, U. (2012). Understanding The Relationship Among Leadership Effectiveness, Leader-Member Interactions And Organizational Citizenship Behaviour In Higher Institutions Of Learning In Ghana. *Journal of International Education Research*, 8(3), 173-193.
- ii. Aryetey, J. (2010). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 96, 252-276.
- iii. Alanzi, W. C. (2010). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 238-241. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.70.
- iv. Baer, S. G. (2014). Subordinate performance, leader-subordinate compatibility, and exchange quality in leader-member dyads: A field study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25(1), 77-92.
- v. Bass, A., & Avolio, E. (1996). *Business research methods*. (2, Ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- vi. Becker, W. M. (2009). Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behavior: A social network perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 70-82.
- vii. Boahen, W. C. (2015). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In W. C. Borman, & N. Schmitt, *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: : Jossey-Bass.
- viii. Bogler, A. P. (2001). Prosocial Organization Behaviours. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725.
- ix. Brown, M. E. (2003). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 595–616.
- x. Crawford, S. (2014). Taiwanese employees' justice perceptions of co-workers' punitive events. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 143-158.
- xi. Creswell, D. (2005). *The attraction paradigm*. New York:: Academic Press.
- xii. Dansereau, F. (2004). A dyadic approach to leadership: Creating and nurturing this approach under fire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 479-490.
- xiii. Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (2007). 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. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(75)90005-7
- xiv. Ejimifor, R. J. (2012). Teacher-principal relationships; Exploring linkages between empowerment and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43, 260-277.
- xv. Eswaran, B., Islam, M. L., & Muhd Yusuf, R. C. (2011). Work value congruence and intrinsic career success: The compensatory roles of leader-member exchange and perceived organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(2), 305-332.
- xvi. Feidler, C. R. (2009). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 827-844.
- xvii. Grant, G. B., & Cashman, J. (2012). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A development approach. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson, *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143 - 166). Kent, Ohio, USA: Comparative Administration Research Institute, Graduate School of Business, Kent State University.
- xviii. Graen, G. B., & Casman, T. A. (2015). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In M. S. B, & L. C. L, *Research in Organizational Behavior* (pp. 175- 208). Greenwich, CT.
- xix. Hulin, R. H., (2001). The structure equation modeling approach: Basic concepts and fundamental issues. In R. H. (Ed.), *Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues and Applications* (pp. 1-15). Thousand Oaks: Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- xx. Kennerly, J. A., (2005). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with Big Five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 326-336.
- xxi. Kiboss, W., & Jemiryott, N. J. (2014). Organizational Citizenship behaviour and workplace deviance: The of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-142.
- xxii. Meyer, K., Katz, L. A., Fisher, J., & Notrica. (2002). Gender and the quality of the leader- member exchange: Findings from a South African organization. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(2), 316-329.
- xxiii. McMillan, R., Schumacher, O. (2006). A review of leader-member exchange research: Future prospects and directions. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 25, 35-88. doi:10.1002/9780470661628
- xxiv. Spector, J. (1994). Leader-member exchange and its dimensions: effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 697–708.
- xxv. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- xxvi. Yukl, G. A. (2001). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- xxvii. Zembylas, X., & Papapastasiou, C. (2004). Supervisor-subordinate convergence in descriptions of leader-member exchange (LMX) quality: Review and testable propositions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(6), 920-932. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10722/85749>