

EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN STATE CORPORATION IN KENYA.

Grace Mwari Itunga^{a*}, Dr. Emmanuel Awuor^b,

^a Management University of Africa, P.O Box 29677-00100, Nairobi Kenya

^b Management University of Africa, P.O Box 29677-00100 Nairobi Kenya

^a itush64@gmail.com

^b eawuor@mua.ac.ke

Abstract

This study aimed at investigating the effect of leadership styles on employee performance in State Corporation in Kenya. The following objective guided the study: to assess the role of leadership styles on employee performance, to determine how transformational leadership style affect employee performance, to establishing how transactional leadership style affect employee performance,, to find out how laissez-faire leadership style affect employee performance ,and examining the extent to which autocratic leadership style affect employee performance. Descriptive Research Design was used as it was suitable for the study content and focus. A stratified random sampling technique was adopted to ensure all categories are equitably represented in the sample. The target population was 283 respondents. A structured self-completed research questionnaire was used. Piloting was done to 10% non-respondents of 283 target population. A sample size of 85 was adopted for this study. Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used for data analysis. The regression analysis revealed a relationship $R = 0.729$ showing a strong positive correlation and revealed that leadership style and employee performance are fundamentally related, and $R^2 = 0.532$ which meant that 53.2% of variation in employee performance can be explained by a unit change in leadership style. The study findings showed that autocratic leadership style is the most exhibited style at the commission followed by laissez faire style and then transactional leadership style with transformational leadership style coming last. Overall scores, where transformational leadership was employed, it was found to be strongly correlated with positive employee performance. Transactional leadership style was also found to be correlated positively with employee performance but in a minimal way. Study recommends that the commission do away with the autocratic leadership style as it would ruin the commission in the long-term.

Keywords: *transformational leadership style, transactional leadership, Laissez-Faire Leadership Style, Autocratic Leadership Style, Employee Performance*

1. INTRODUCTION

The 21st century leader need's greater awareness of diverse factors and new set of competencies, characteristics that lead to success and to help them make relevant, correct and timely decisions in leadership of change and leadership of subordinates. Leadership is enthusiastic atmosphere and culture in an organization (Alphasand and Al-Amaze, 2016). Hudurzue, R. E., (2015) suggested that effective leadership style could promote excellence in the development of the members of the organization.

Early studies concentrated on identifying the personality traits which characterized successful leaders (Mahoney *et al.*, 1960). Trait theories assume that successful leaders are born and have certain innate qualities which distinguish them from non-leaders. However, the difficulty in categorizing and validating these characteristics led to widespread criticism of this trait approach, signalling the emergence of 'style and behavioural' approaches to leadership. Recent studies on management have made a contrast between transactional management which is stated to be 'instrumental' and regularly focuses on exchange relationship with subordinates (Bass, B. M, and Avolio, B. J., 2000). Transformational leadership is stated to be visionary, and enthusiastic, with an inherent potential to motivate subordinates Avolio, B.J., (2007). Laissez Faire is stated to be palms off strategy where leaders depart followers to set their personal goals and make choice (Choudhary, A., Q., 2013).

In Africa , governments have realised of the importance of determining the appropriate leadership style and employing it to improve employee performance in State Corporations. Nuhu, (2004) sought to study the effect of leadership styles on employee performance in Kampala City Council in Uganda. The study revealed that laissez faire management was once practiced especially in higher places of work and was existent especially in decrease offices. According to him, this kind of management style has a high quality relationship with worker performance, seeing that most personnel believed that they would alternatively be made relaxed at work as an alternative than be coerced. In reality this used to be eminent in some departments that supervisors or managers where naturally approachable, friendly and no longer arrogant at employees. Coercion as in the case of Autocratic leadership leads to harassment and demoralises personnel hence affecting negatively their motivation to work. Due to this correlation, his learn about showed that laissez-faire leadership leads to multiplied worker performance to some extent. This implied that in these departments, improved employee performance actually existed but in a slow pace, as compared to autocratic leadership style that led to tension in work environment.

In Kenya, many State Corporations have been underperforming due to poor leadership styles employed. Majority have since closed down due to their inability to meet its operational obligations resulting to huge

debts and massive job losses. This has been a burden to the government as well as tax payers. A point in case is Uchumi Supermarket, National bank, Mumias Sugar Company among others. The Kenya Meat Commission has been in the limelight of late. Consistent with (Obiwuru,T.C., Akwo, A., T., and Akpa, V., O.,(2011), many groups within the Kenya State Corporations, have recorded cases of immoral and unethical retail practices e.g. gratifications, excessive labour turnover, incapability to fulfil simple required responsibilities, and steady financial distress syndrome. The state corporation management has been a total failure, hence the need to relook at employing the appropriate styles of leadership to improve employee performance as well as growth of state corporations.

Leadership style is viewed as a combination of different characteristics, traits and behaviours that are used by leaders for interacting with their subordinates. Mitonga, Munga, J. R., (2012) posited that leadership is a pattern associated with managerial behaviour, which is designed to integrate the organizational or non-public activity and effects for accomplishing unique objectives. Harris, J., (2007) also postulated that leadership fashion can be defined as the type of relationship that is used by using an individual so as to make human beings work collectively for a common intention or objective. According to modern leadership styles, leadership styles can be categorized as follows: (1) transformational leadership style, (2) transactional leadership style, (3) Laissez Faire Leadership style, (4) Autocratic Leadership Style (Harris, 2007)

1.1 Problem statement

Kenya Meat Commission is a state run corporation that was formed by an Act of Parliament in 1950. The main objective was to provide livestock farmers with a market as well as promote meat industry both locally and internationally. This corporation represents another missed opportunity for transforming the livestock industry in Kenya. The sad story is that due to mismanagement it has lost opportunities to other countries in the region and the world. This has worked to the detriment of the economy and the people of Kenya in terms of lost wealth creation and job opportunities. Mismanagement of the institution's resources caused it to be closed down for 15 years and only reopened in June 2006 after the Kenya government reinvested 1.9B in a restructuring effort. In 2006 – 2009 the corporation made a loss of 250m. This was attributed to inappropriate leadership styles employed which culminated into unethical retail practises, gratification, excessive labour turnover coupled with inability to satisfy required responsibilities, and constant economic misery syndrome. Lack of transparency and accountability from top leadership, coupled with frequent change of leadership has contributed to poor performance. Each individual appointed seeking to impose new strategies that are not compatible with emerging trends in the

meat industry (Koech and Namusonge, 2012). According to Richard, R. S., (2010) leadership is the ability to influence people towards attainment of goals. This motivated me to develop interest in the topic of leadership styles in State Corporation due to the rising concern of many stakeholders. Pattanayak, B., (2005), the performance of an employee is his/her resultant behaviour on a task which can be observed and evaluated. He noted that worker performance is the contribution made by a man or woman in the accomplishment of organizational goals. Here employee performance is actually the result of patterns of action carried out. This is perceived as executing described duties, meeting deadlines, team input, and the cohesion of each leadership and performance. This should be evident through style and approach used by leaders in the attempt to cause efficiency which requires specific leadership approaches to unique performance challenges in achieving departmental goals. The above should as pointed by (Armstrong, M., 2009) lead to efficiency, specialization, effective feedback and good organizational relations. Therefore this research will seek to determine the effect of leadership styles on employee performance in State Corporations in Kenya.

1.2 Specific Objective

The main objective of this study is to investigate the effect of leadership styles on employee performance in State Corporation in Kenya.

1.2.1 Research Questions

- i. What is the effect of transformational leadership style on employee performance at State Corporation in Kenya?
- ii. What is the effect of transactional leadership style on employee performance at State Corporation in Kenya?
- iii. What is the effect of laissez-faire style of leadership on performance of employee at State Corporation in Kenya?
- iv. What is the effect of leadership style on performance of at State Corporation in Kenya?

1.3 Conceptual Framework

The study sought to find out the roles of all types of leadership styles as listed below as the independent variables and employee performance of State Corporations in Kenya as the dependent variable




Figure 2. 1 Conceptual Framework

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Teamwork Theory

According to Bass and Avoli, (2006) and Burns, (1978), Transformational Management idea has advanced from and contains elements of preceding leadership types, such as trait and behaviour theories, charismatic, situational and transactional leadership. The Transformational Leadership theory states that leadership is a technique by which a character interacts with others and is capable to create a strong relationship that consequence in an excessive proportion of confidence and performance. This effects in an enlarged motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic, in leaders and followers. Transformational theory focus upon the connections formed between leaders and followers. Transformational leadership is the leader's capacity to encourage followers to upward thrust above their own personal goals for the larger top of the organization.

Bass and Avoli, (2006) theorized that the transformational style of management comes from deeply held private values which cannot be negotiated and appeals to the subordinates sense of ethical obligation and values. Bass declared there have been four sorts of transformational leadership behaviour, particularly idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and mental stimulation. According to transformational leadership theory, a leader can make a positive difference in

an employee's life and Bass 'Transformational Leadership Theory' may be a solution in various cases. The theory enhances the motivation, morale, and performance of followers through a variety of mechanisms (Bushra, F., Usman, A., & Naveed, A., 2011). These consist of connecting the follower's sense of identity and self to the challenge and the collective identification of the company through being a position model for followers that inspires them and makes them interested, challenging followers to take increased possession for their work, and understanding the strengths and weaknesses of followers, so that the leader can align followers with tasks that beautify their performance.

Transformational leadership Theory assumptions are that people will follow a person who inspires them. A person with a vision and passion can achieve great things. The way to getting things done is by injecting enthusiasm and energy. Transformational Leadership theory is applicable for this study in that a leader needs to develop a vision, a view of future that will excite and convert potential followers. The leader must sell their visions continuously by creating trust and personal integrity as a critical package that they are selling as well as find the way forward for others to follow. The route may not be obvious but with a clear vision the direction will be known. The leader should take charge by remaining upfront and central during the action while at the same time remain visible through their attitudes and actions Bass, B.M (1990).

2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 Teamwork Development and Organizational Performance

2.2.1 Transformational Leadership and Employee Performance.

As stated by Bass, and Avolio (2006) transformational leadership is one of the best methods to enhance the individuals and group's performance. Transformational leaders motivate followers to exert and explore existing as well as new prospects. TL proactively helps the followers to attain goals with high standards. Yew, L., K., (2014) suggests that transformational leadership is linked to innovative capabilities, and is defined as a leadership style that transforms followers to rise above their self-interest by altering their morale, ideals, interests and values. This motivates the employees to perform better than initially expected (Bass, 2006). This relates to motivating followers to achieve past expectation and encouraging followers to look past their own self-interest for the betterment of an organization. Transformational leadership creates an environment in which employees are motivated and energized (Bruch, 2013).

Motivated personnel working in supportive neighbourhood weather provide larger excellent client service, reinforcing organizational performance and aim to monetary wonderful factors for shareholders

(Giroux, M., 2014). The behaviours hooked up in TL like motivation, intellectual challenge, concept and person consideration are seen as a core attribute of first-rate leaders that ought to be familiar around the world. Bass, (1985) counselled 4 dimensions of transformational leadership trend which consists of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and mental simulation and individualized.

2.2.2 Transactional Leadership and Employee performance

Transactional leadership can be defined as the exchange of targets and rewards between the management and the employees (Ojokuku, R., Odetayo, T., & Sajuyigbe, A., (2012). This leadership style particularly helps in creating an environment that is optimal for employee performance as well as articulating a compelling vision that enhances the overall organizational performance (Longe, O.J, 2014). Transactional leadership involves an exchange process that results in follower compliance with leader's request but not likely to generate enthusiasm and commitment to task objective. The leader focuses on having internal actors perform the tasks required for the organization to reach its desired goals (Boehnke, 2015). The objective of the transactional leader is to ensure that the path to goal attainment is clearly understood by the internal actors, to remove potential barrier within the system, and to motivate the actors to achieve the predetermined goals (House and Aditya, 1997). Transactional leaders display both constructive and corrective behaviours.

Transactional leadership gives guidelines on how the work is done and focuses on the results. Such a leader is impressed by order and expects the subordinates to be compliant and ready to work as instructed. Hurdeuzen, (2015) researched on the impact of leadership behaviour on employee performance and found out that leadership behaviours were very important factors for the employee productivity and growth of a company in the service sector. This leadership is quite useful in productivity as it meets deadlines and works in a structured way. When a transactional leader gives a task to be done, they expect timely completion whether the resources are available or not. Failure to complete the task, the employee is subjected to disciplinary action and if successfully completed, they are rewarded. Transactional leaders rarely think outside the box. They are conformed to the organizational structure and highly resist change. They want things to remain as they are. These leaders do not encourage creativity as they believe new and many ideas spoil the stipulated processes.

2.2.3 Laissez-faire Leadership and Employee Performance

Laissez-faire leadership is defined as a form of passive leadership where the supervisor or manager avoids responsibility, commitment, encouragement and motivation of setting the direction of the followers in accomplishing the organization goals (Arham, A., F., 2014). Characteristics of Laissez- faire leadership style are task orientation which is the extreme loose principle, which includes non-interference policy that allows complete freedom to all the employees to set their own goals and make decisions for task accomplishment (Cummings, 2010). According to Richard, (2010), explained laissez faire style of leadership as one that ‘abdicates’ responsibility and avoids making decision and lacks commitment or involvement in guiding employees. Employee lack motivation and encouragement due to absence of leadership involvement and guidance in setting the direction of accomplishing organisational goals.

Laissez-faire leadership style has been defined by Northouse, (2014) as the leadership that sets the direction of what is to be accomplished by the followers with very little supervision. This style allows complete freedom to group decision without leader’s participation. Subordinates are free to do what they like. The main role the leader plays is just to supply materials. The leader does not interfere with or participate in the course of events determined by the group. It is also known as delegative leadership, where leaders are hands-off and allow group members to make the decisions (Nusair, N., Abaqueh, R., Bae, Y., K (2012). Researchers have found that this is generally the leadership style that leads to the lowest productivity among group members (Cumming, 2010). Since there is absolutely no control or guidance in this style of leadership, wrong decisions can impose devastating effects on organizations (Stafford, 2010). Laissez-faire can also be considered as destructive leadership behaviour because in the absence of the leader's control some individuals can dominate group decisions and bully other members in the group.

2.2.4 Autocratic Leadership and Employee Performance

According to Khan, S., Asghar, M., & Zaheer, A., (2015) autocratic leadership is where manager retains as much power and decision-making authorisation as possible. Luftman, J., N., (2004), stated that autocratic leaders are high-handed leaders and are the centre of every activity that goes on in the establishment and all authority emanates and ends with them. According Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., & Haider, N. (2015) autocratic leaders are characterized by an “I tell” philosophy. Autocratic leaders tell other people what to do. Leaders exclusively make decisions and production is emphasized at the expense of any human consideration. According to AKor, (2004), the autocratic leaders force their followers to execute the services and strategies according to the narrow way. They solely exercises decision making

and authority for determining policy, procedures for achieving goals, work task and relationships and controls reward and punishment. No group participation. The leadership style is less creative and only promotes one-sided conversation. This severely affects the motivation and satisfaction level of employees. The style is more suitable when the projects are to be completed within provided deadlines.

According to Al Khajeh, (2018) this style of leadership considers the manager to be the most powerful entity, the primary decision maker and authority. It is based on the traditional premise that leaders are good managers who direct and control their people. Those followers (employees) are obedient subordinates who follow orders. This position is supported by Obiwuru *et al.*, (2011) states that employees under autocratic leadership style are expected to follow the orders of their managers even if they do not agree or do not receive any explanation. She argued that in order to motivate employees, managers using autocratic leadership styles often employ a set of rewards and punishments that are highly structured. Autocratic leadership represents all those leaders who makes decision without the consent of team members and is usually applied when quick decision is taken and team agreement is not important for acquisition of successful results (Al khajeh, 2018). Little opportunity is given to staff and team members to make suggestions, even if it is in the best interest of the team or organization. Koech *et al.*, (2012) posited that autocratic leaders use their position to pursue aggressive and visionary goals and their power through organization culture, press and media to praise their own initial success. The indicators for autocratic style of leadership are control. The leaders are high handed. They are the centre of activity that goes on in the establishment and that all authority emanates and ends with them (Akor, 2014).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

Research design is the overall strategy one chooses to integrate different components of the study or a plan model with in depth content (the time, expenditure or budget, the means of data management, analysis) layout on how the research has been conducted and output expectation (Kothari, 2004). Descriptive research design has been used as it is suitable for the study content and subject focus.

3.2 Target Population

According to Trapp, (2009) target population is the group of individuals from which samples are drawn during a research. In this research, the target population is the entire population of employees of Kenya Meat Corporation, but the predefined set of potential respondents; both males and females; across all

departments of: Human Resource/Administration, Finance, Procurement, production, quality and control, livestock, Veterinary services, Sales, Marketing, ICT, Internal Audit, Legal, Housing, Transport and depots . The target population was 283 respondents.

3.3 Sampling Method and Sample Size

A stratified random sampling technique was adopted to ensure all categories are equitably represented. This is a technique which involves the division of a population into smaller sub-groups known as strata. Strata is formed based on members shared attributes or characteristics. Respondents were chosen at random from the strata. The technique is appropriate because it allowed the researcher to divide the population and reach the required size that provides reliable detailed information (Kothari, 2004).

Table 3. 1 Sample Size

Category	Target population	Sample Size
Human Resource/Administration	18	6
Finance Department	15	5
Procurement Department	10	3
Livestock Department	15	5
Veterinary Department	15	5
Production Department	80	21
Engineering Department	15	5
Quality Control Department	15	5
Sales Department	20	5
Marketing Department	10	3
Internal Audit	10	3
Legal Department	10	3
ICT Department	10	3
Housing Department	10	3
Transport Department	15	5
Depots Department	15	5
Total	283	85

(Source: Kenya Meat Corporation 2018)

3.4 Research Instruments

Primary data was used in this study which was collected from the selected sample respondents using a questionnaire.

3.5. Pilot Study

Piloting was done to test the validity and reliability of the instruments. Validity demonstrates how much the instrument measure develops under scrutiny. In this examination, reliability was achieved by pre-testing the questionnaire with a choice from non-respondent. The results of the pilot study were not incorporated into the findings. Bryman *et al.*, (2003) contends that for a survey to deliver valuable outcomes, it must have legitimacy and unwavering quality. The pilot test sample population was 10% of the target population.

3.5.1 Validity and Reliability of the Research Instrument

Validity is the aspect of questionnaire gauging what is supposed to measure (Maizura *et al.*, 2011). Content validity of the instrument was done experts in human resource management. Reliability refers to the repeatability, stability or internal consistency of a questionnaire (Maizura *et al.*, 2011). The study adopted Cronbach Alpha to test reliability of the research instruments. The values ranged from 0 to 1 where values between 0.7 to 1 indicate considerable and acceptable reliability whereas values below 0.7 were unacceptable and less reliable.

3.5. Data Analysis and Presentation

The quantitative data collected was coded using Statistical Packages for Social Scientists tool (SPSS Version 23) and analyzed through the use descriptive and inferential statistics.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 Response Rate

From the 85 respondents sampled to participate, 68 responded while 17 did not respond. This formed a response rate of 80%. The response rate was adequate to analyse the effect of leadership styles on employee performance of state corporations and in particular Kenya Meat Commission since it was above 50% according to the recommendation of Mugenda (2003).

Table 4.1 Response Rate of Respondents

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Returned	68	80%
Unreturned	17	20%
Total	100	100%

4.2 Demographic Profile

Gender characteristic of the respondents showed that, majority of the respondents equivalent to 64% were male against 36% who were female. This indicates that, opinions presented by respondents in relation to Leadership styles and employee performance was from each gender category. Therefore, the results obtained could be attributed or inclined to a particular gender. Majority of the respondents tallying to 48% were aged between 26-35 years. While the list proportion was 8% and were respondent aged above 55 years. An analysis of the level of education of the respondents showed that, more than half of the respondents, represented by 53% had undergraduate Qualification. Those who indicated their academic level as postgraduate were 15%. Where's those who indicated to have secondary school qualification were 32%. Education background is useful in this study because it defines the level of understanding of the research instrument and hence the phenomena under study. Therefore, respondents in this study understood effect of leadership styles on organization performance and thus presented relevant information.

Table 4.2 Demographic Profile

Demographic profile		Frequency	%
Gender	Male	44	65%
	Female	24	35%
Age (years)	18-25	9	13%
	26-35	33	48%
	36-45	10	15%
	46-55	8	11%
	Over 55	8	13%
Education Level	High School	22	32%
	Undergraduate	36	53%
	Postgraduate	10	15%
Total		68	100%

4.3 Inferential Analysis

4.3.1 The Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance:

The regression analysis was carried out to estimate the effect of leadership styles (independent variables) on employees' performance (dependent variable). Results are presented in Tables 4.3-4.5. The study sought to investigate the effect of leadership style on employee performance. Regression analysis (see table 4.3) was done with employee performance as the dependent variable and leadership style as the

predictor factor. Regression analysis (see table 4.3) was done with employee performance as the dependent variable and leadership style as the predictor factor. The regression analysis revealed a relationship $R = 0.729$, which showed a strong positive correlation and revealed that leadership styles and employee performance are fundamentally related, and $R^2 = .532$ which meant that 53% of variation in employee performance can be explained by a unit change in leadership style. The results were enumerated as seen in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 – Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.729 ^a	.532	.502	.29454

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic leadership style, Transactional Leadership, transformational leadership, laissez-faire leadership style
 b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance Score

Table 4.4 presents model fits results on leadership styles and employee performance.

Table 4.4 – Model Fit Results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.214	4	1.553	17.906	.000 ^b
	Residual	5.465	63	.087		
	Total	11.679	67			

- a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Transformational leadership style, transactional leadership style, Laissez faire leadership style and Autocratic Leadership style.

The value of $F=17.9$ shows that leadership styles statistically and significantly affect employee performance which means regression model is good fit of the data and that leadership styles significantly influences the employee performance. The level of significance is 0.05 hence the regression model significantly predicts the dependent variable. Results are enumerated as shown in table 4.4.

Table 4.5 coefficient of regression model.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.429	.402		3.559	.001
Transformational leadership style	.192	.085	.204	2.269	.027
Transactional leadership Style	-.148	.072	-.185	2.065	.043
Laissez faire leadership style	.376	.101	.368	3.727	.000
Autocratic leadership style	.342	.073	.441	4.698	.000

Source (Author, 2019)

The coefficient results on transformational leadership style shows a medium relationship between leadership style and employee performance while transactional leadership style insignificantly negatively predicts employee performance, with $\beta=.192$, ($p < 0.01$) and $\beta=-.148$, ($p < 0.01$) respectively. Laissez faire leadership style and autocratic leadership styles show a strong relationship between leadership style and employee performance with $\beta=.376$ ($p < 0.01$) which is 37.6%, and Autocratic leadership style, $\beta=.342$ ($p < 0.01$) 34%. The coefficient results show that Laissez Faire and Autocratic leadership styles positively predict perform

Regression model for the study

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + e$$

$$Y = 1.429 + 0.192 X_1 + (-0.148) X_2 + 0.376 X_3 + 0.342 X_4 + e$$

B_0 = intercept, Y = employee performance in State Corporation, X_1 =Transformational, leadership style, X_2 = Transactional Leadership style, X_3 = Laissez Faire leadership style, X_4 =Autocratic leadership style, e =Model deviation.

The regression analysis shows that Autocratic and Laissez Faire leadership styles positively predicted employee performance. If supervisors exhibited more of this leadership styles there will be higher employee performance. Transformation leadership style moderately predicts employee leadership style. A combination of all leadership styles will improve employee performance. This is consistent with past studies by Gimuguni, *et al*, (2014), on effect of leadership styles on employee performance of local governments. A case study of Mbale district. The study revealed that there as moderate high positive and significant relationship between the four leadership styles, transformational transactional, laissez faire, and autocratic leadership styles. Leaders use autocratic leadership style to influence employees to perform their duties within the set deadlines.

A study by Steyrer, *et al*,(2002), a study on impact of leadership styles on employee performance in organisations. The findings reveal that autocratic leader is the one who determines the activities, techniques and policies to employees and expects the employees to follow them. According to study by Nuhu (2004), on kampala Municipal Council, he posited that Laissez faire leadership style has a positive relationship with employees performance, since most employees believed that they would rather be made comfortable at work. A study by Keninde and Banjo, (2014), on impact of leadership styles on employee performance: a case study of Petroleum Resources revealed that this type of leadership would bring effective results in organisations because it motivates employees to go beyond ordinary expectations, appeals to followers' higher order needs and moral values, generates the passion and commitment of followers for the mission and values of the organisation.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The regression analysis revealed a relationship $R=0.729$ which showed a strong positive correlation and revealed that leadership styles and employee performance are fundamentally related and $R^2 = .532$ meaning that 53.2% of variation in employee performance can be explained by a unit change in leadership style. The values of $F=17.906$ show that leadership styles statistically and significantly affect

employee performance. The coefficient results show that autocratic and laissez faire, and transformational leadership styles positively predict employee performance with $\beta=.342(p < 0.01)$ 34%, $\beta=.376(p < 0.01)$ which is 37.6%, and $\beta=.192, (p < 0.01)$. The study findings revealed that autocratic leadership style is the most exhibited at the Kenya Meat Commission followed by laissez faire and transformational leadership styles

5.2 Recommendations

KMC expect employees to perform, supervisors expect their followers to perform too. The results of this study provided insights into what employees need from their supervisors and the kind of leadership behaviors they prefer. This information could be used to help develop strategies and meet organizational needs through leadership behavior development. The leaders or supervisors should be aware of what is important for the subordinates and the organizations as a whole and encourage the employees to see the opportunities and challenges around them creatively. Regarding to the results of correlation analysis, it indicated that transformational leadership, transactional leadership, Laissez Faire and autocratic leadership all have significant correlations with employee performance.

References

- Akor, P. U. (2014). Influence of Autocratic Leadership Style on Job Performance. *Journal of Education and Social Research*, 4(7), 148–152.
- Arham, A. F. (2014). Leadership and Performance: the case study of Malaysian SMEs in the Service Sector. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 4(3), 343–355.
- Armstrong. (2009). *Armstrong Handbook of Management and Leadership, A Guide to Managing for Results*. (2nd Ed.). London Philadelphia.
- Armstrong, M. (2004). *Human Resource Management Theory and Practice*. London: Bath Press Ltd.
- Armstrong, M. (2004). *Human Resource Management Theory and Practice*. London: Bath Press Ltd. Bath Press Ltd.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory building. *America, Psychologist*.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). The implications of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Individual, Team, and Organizational Development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*,
- Bess, J. L. & Godman, P. (2001). Leadership Ambiguity in Universities and K-12 Schools & the Limits of Contemporary leadership Theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 419-450
- Burns, A. (1978). *Transformational theory: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Sage. Sage.
- Burns, G. (1978). *The Micro politics of Educational Leadership: From Control to Empowerment*. Columbia University, 1234 Amsterdam Ave, New York, NY 10027: Teachers College Press.

- Bushra, F., Usman, A., & Naveed, A. (2011). Effect of Transformational Leadership on Employees' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Banking Sector of Lahore (Pakistan). *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(18).
- Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of Transactional and Laissez Faire Leadership Style on Motivation. *Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 258–264.
- Choudhary, A. (2013). Impact of Transactional and Laissez Faire Leadership Style on Motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, (7), 258–264.
- Collins, J., & Hussey, R. (2009). Business Research: A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Post Graduate Research.
- Egri, C. P., & Herman, S. (2011). Leadership in the North American environmental sector: Values, leadership styles, and contexts of environmental leaders and their organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 571–604.
- Fieldler, F. (1978). The Contingency Model and the Dynamics of Leadership Process. *New York: Academic*, (Inc. L. Berkowitz (Ed)).
- Gadot, P. (2007). An Empirical Examination of Two Competing Models of Leadership. *Managerial Psychology*.
- Gilman, L. (2013). Transformational Leadership and Shared Values: The Building Blocks of Trust. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- Gimuguni, L., Nandutu, J., & Magolo, A. (2010). Effect of leadership styles on performance of local governments in Uganda. A case of Mbale District.
- Giroux, M. (2014). Exploring the leadership continuum: The relevance of transformational leadership on organizational performance.
- Goodnight. (2011). A central Connection to All Effective Leadership Styles is Effective. Room for Employee Autonomy, and Job Satisfaction Suffers. *Penn State*.
- Hill, C. W., & Jones, G. R. (2008). Strategic Management: An Integrated Approach (th8 Ed.). Boston: MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The Social Scientific Study of Leadership: Quo Vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409–473.
- Howell, D. A. (1996). International and Cross-Cultural Leadership. Handbook for International Management Research. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Hoxha, D. (2009), "The Performance of Micro Firms in Kosova: Size, Age and Educational Implications", *International Journal of Globalisation and Small Business*, Vol. 3, No.1, p. 25-40
- Hurduzeu, R. E. (2015). The impact of leadership on organizational performance. *Practical Application of Science*, 7, 289–294.
- Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., & Haider, N. (2015). Effect of Leadership Style on Employee Performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(5), 1–6.
- James Macgregor, B. (2010). Leadership Burns Pioneering Study Introduces the Highly Influential Theory in Transformational Leadership. Scotts London.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
- Luftman, J. N. (2004). Managing the Information Technology Resource: Leadership in the Information Age. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- MacMillan, M. (2000). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance: a survey of selected small scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu. (Unpublished Thesis). Lagos.
- Maher, & Green. (2002). Careers 2000. London. London: The Stationery Office.
- Maizura, M., Aminah, A., Wan Aida, W.M. 2011. Total phenolic content and antioxidant activity of kesum (*Polygonum minus*), ginger (*Zingiber officinale*) and turmeric (*Curcuma longa*) extract. *Int. Food Res. J.*, 18: 529–534.
- Men, L. R., & Stacks, D. W. (2013). The impact of leadership style and employee empowerment on perceived organizational reputation. *Journal of Communication Management*, 17(2), 171–192.

- Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: Acts. Nairobi.
- Nusair, N., Abaaneh, R., & Bae, Y. K. (2012). The Impact of Transformational Leadership style on Innovation as Perceived by Public Employees in Jordan. *International Journal of Communication and Management*, 22(3), 182–201.
- Nwankwo, B. A. (2005). *Administrative Theories and Practices in Organization*. Nigeria: AP Express Publishing Company, 1–356.
- Obiwuru, T. C., Akwo, A. T., & Akpa, V. O. (2011). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance: A survey of selected small scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu council development area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business Management Research*, 1(7), 100.
- Ojokuku, R., Odetayo, T., & Sajuyigbe, A. (2012). Impact of Leadership Style on Organizational Performance: A Case Study of Nigerian Banks. *American Journal of Business and Management*, 1(4), 202–207.
- Information Technology*, 20, 198-207.
- Prasetya, A., & Kato, M. (2011). Effect of Financial and Non-Financial Compensation to Employee Performance (Paper Presented at 2nd international Research Symposium in Service Management). Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Rasool, H. F., Arfeen, I. U., Mothi, W., & Aslam, U. (2015). Leadership Styles and its Impact on Employee's Performance in health sector of Pakistan. *University Research Journal*, 5(1).
- Richard, R. S. (2010). *Management*. (6th Edition). London: Apprentice Hall.
- Shafie, Bizhan, Baghersalimi, Saeed (2018). Impact of Transformational Leadership on Employee Creativity and Efficiency. *International Journal of Innovation Management*. 6(1).
- Sofi, D. (2015). Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 10 pages.
- Stafford. (2010). Factors contributing to nursing leadership: A Systematic Review.
- Steyrer, G., Lowe, K., Mackenzie, P., & Proctor Thomson, P. (2002). Nothing New under the Sun: Transformational Leadership from a Historical Perspective. *Management Decision*.
- Wegner. (2004). *Transactional Leadership and Job Performance: An Empirical Investigation*. University of Utara Malaysia and Sukkur Institute of Business Administration, Pakistan.
- Wang & Xu. (2008). The utility and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction within a path-goal theory framework. *Journal of American Society for Leadership*, 9(1), 558–697.
- Yew, L. K. (2014). Transformational Leadership: Is It Time For A Recall? *International Journal of Management and Applied Research*, 1(19).