

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378121093>

Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Productivity: a Case Study Of Zenith Bank Nigeria PLC

Article · January 2024

DOI: 10.59890/ijasrv2i1.1231

CITATIONS

2

READS

1,561

1 author:



Segun Kehinde

52 PUBLICATIONS 78 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Productivity: a Case Study Of Zenith Bank Nigeria PLC

Segun Kehinde^{1*}, Chinonye Moses², Borishade Taiye³, Kehinde Oladele⁴, Nifemi Obembe⁵, Simon Ilogho⁶, Kemi Kehinde⁷, Tola Kehinde⁸

^{1,2,3,4,5,6}Covenant University, Nigeria

⁷Anchor University, Nigeria

⁸Redeemers University, Nigeria

Corresponding Author: Segun Kehinde segun.kehindepgs@stu.cu.edu.ng

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Leadership Styles, Organizational Productivity, Banking Industry

Received : 20, November

Revised : 22, December

Accepted: 24, January

©2024 Kehinde, Moses, Taiye, Oladele, Obembe, Ilogho, Kehinde, Kehinde: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study investigates the profound influence of leadership styles on organizational productivity, focusing on a case study of Zenith Bank Nigeria Plc within the banking industry. Leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping the culture and efficiency of an organization, and this research examines the specific leadership styles and their effects on employee performance, teamwork, and overall productivity. By analyzing the dynamic relationship between leadership and productivity, this study aims to provide valuable insights for both the banking industry and leadership development. It explores the challenges and opportunities within Zenith Bank Nigeria Plc and suggests strategies for optimizing leadership approaches to enhance organizational performance. The findings of this research have practical implications for leaders, managers, and stakeholders in the banking sector, offering a deeper understanding of how leadership styles can be harnessed to drive increased productivity and competitiveness. This study contributes to the ongoing discourse on effective leadership within the banking industry, facilitating informed decision-making and promoting sustained growth and success.

INTRODUCTION

The impact of leadership style on employees' perceptions and performance within an organization is substantial, influencing the overall mode of operation and eventual success or failure (Li, 2004). Leaders play a pivotal role in shaping subordinates' attitudes through direct interactions and by contributing to the organizational culture. Understanding these dynamics is essential for decision-makers, as leadership styles shape the actions and operations of managers, determining the overall effectiveness of an organization. Despite limited research on leadership in Nigeria, prevailing literature suggests a perception that African leaders, particularly in Nigeria, struggle with effectiveness in the context of a globalized economic system (Ochola, 2007).

Leadership, fundamentally, involves a complex interaction between designated leaders and the social and organizational environment. Management paradigms have evolved from classical autocracy to more creative and participative approaches, reflecting the changing nature of the workforce (Stewart, 1994). Various leadership styles exist, such as autocratic, bureaucratic, laissez-faire, charismatic, democratic, participative, situational, transactional, and transformational leadership. The effectiveness of a particular style depends on the context, and no one style is universally ideal. New leadership theories, including transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire styles, have gained prominence in organizational studies (Bogler, 2001, 2002; Heller, 1993; Mckee, 1991; Timothy and Ronald, 2004).

In Nigeria, organizations grapple with poor performance, low productivity, and high turnover rates attributed to negative employee attitudes. Job satisfaction emerges as a critical factor in assessing overall employee contribution and organizational performance. The banking sector, constituting approximately 39% of Nigeria's service industry, plays a pivotal role in the economy, necessitating constant improvement in competitiveness and service quality to satisfy customers. Employees serve as vital links between banks and customers, emphasizing the need for strong manager-employee relations to ensure customer satisfaction.

The research problem centers on the significance of leadership style in influencing organizational functions, affecting job performance, and shaping job satisfaction. Robbins (2003) emphasizes that leadership, as a management function, aims to manage employee behavior and predict productivity, resignations, and job satisfaction. Previous research has often focused on the links between leadership styles, job satisfaction, and employee performance with organizational performance, neglecting the direct impact of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction and productivity.

While extensive research exists on leadership styles and human resource behaviors in Western countries, such as the United States and Europe, and in Asia, there is a gap in understanding the nuances in the Nigerian context (Chen,

2004; Ojo, 2009). With the expanding global trade and rapid development in the Nigerian economy, there is an imperative for more research in this region to maximize development within the business and industrial sectors (Okpara, 2007). Given the vital role of banking in the Nigerian economy, it is crucial to assess whether the effects of leadership styles hold true in this context. Therefore, the primary objective of this study is to examine the impact of leadership style on organizational productivity in the Nigerian banking industry.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In prior research, the concept of leadership has been defined as "the manner in which a vision is established to determine the direction for future movement and goal achievement" (Richards & Engle, 1985). Various perspectives on leadership have surfaced, depicting it as the focal point of group activities, a matter of personality, a theme of motivation, the exertion of power, a form of persuasion, a power dynamic, a tool for goal attainment, an outcome of communication, a distinct role, an initiator of structure, and various combinations of these interpretations. Leadership is recognized as one of the most dynamic forces in individual and organizational interactions. A proficient leader not only motivates subordinates to enhance efficiency but also addresses their needs in the pursuit of organizational objectives (Hsien & Chuang, 2004). Moreover, leadership is perceived as a social influence process, where the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates to achieve organizational goals (Omolayo, 2000). It is characterized as a process in which one person exerts social influence over other group members (Bamigboye, 2000), a mechanism for shaping the activities of individuals or groups toward goal achievement in specific situations (Akanwa, 1997), and a relational concept involving both the influencing agent and the influenced individual (Eze, 1995). Effective leadership is, therefore, gauged by the degree to which a leader consistently and progressively guides and directs followers toward the collectively agreed-upon destination defined by the entire group (Omolayo, 2000).

Leadership Style

Leadership style is defined as the degree of guidance provided by leaders to subordinates in influencing their behavior towards the achievement of organizational objectives (Gibson & Marcoulides, 1993). Various theories on leadership style have been put forward by different authors, one of which is the model introduced by Blake and Robert (1985) that categorizes leadership style into Task-Oriented and People-Oriented classifications.

People-Oriented Leadership, also known as Relations-Oriented Leadership, stands in opposition to Task-Oriented Leadership. In this approach,

leaders concentrate on managing, supporting, and developing individuals to improve their job performance. The focus is on fostering positive relationships and cultivating an environment conducive to high-quality output from the team.

Conversely, Task-Oriented Leadership revolves around efficiently completing tasks. Leaders in this category may exhibit a more autocratic approach, providing clear and active instructions to team members regarding tasks and delineating the necessary roles. They establish structures, plan, organize, and closely monitor progress to ensure the successful completion of tasks. This style places a premium on task accomplishment and adherence to predefined processes.




Figure 1. Blake and Robert Two-Dimension Leadership style; Task-Oriented Vs People-oriented Leadership

Bass & Avolio (1997) introduced Leadership Style as follows:

- i) Transactional Leadership motivates subordinates by establishing incentives.
- ii) Transformational Leadership represents individuals with this leadership style as authentic leaders who consistently inspire their teams with a shared vision of the future.

Leadership Style

Leadership is commonly defined as the ability to influence a group of people with the aim of achieving specific goals (Lussier, 1990; Robbins and Coulter, 2001). It stands out as one of the extensively studied areas globally (Masood et al., 2006). Even though numerous studies on leadership have been

published in organizational literature, the exact nature of leadership and its intricate connections to crucial variables like subordinate satisfaction, commitment, and performance remain elusive and not fully understood.

Leadership

Although leadership has been a subject of interest for historians and philosophers over the centuries, scientific studies on the topic only commenced in the early 1900s. Since then, the body of knowledge has rapidly expanded, evidenced by the more than 350 definitions scholars have proposed for the term. Offering a single, specific definition of leadership is a complex task, as acknowledged by Bass in 1985. In a broad sense, leadership is defined as an influence relationship between leaders and followers aimed at achieving specific goals (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978). The term "influence" denotes that the relationship among individuals is not passive but rather multidirectional; superiors influence subordinates, and vice versa. It is crucial to distinguish leadership from management. While managers focus on short-term issues within an organization, leaders adopt a much broader perspective. Early leadership theories concentrated on the characteristics of successful leaders, including their traits, behavior, power, influence, and situational approaches (e.g., Likert, 1967; Mintzberg, 1973; McClelland & Burnham, 1976). In contrast, more recent theories have shifted the focus to the role of followers and the interconnected nature of leadership.

(a) Transformational Leadership:

Transformational leaders set themselves apart from transactional leaders by engaging with followers at a more profound level. Instead of simply exchanging tasks for rewards, transformational leaders present a compelling vision, instill a sense of mission, evoke pride, and establish trust through charisma (Avolio et al., 1991; Bass et al., 1990). They demonstrate various behaviors, including:

- **Idealized Influence (Attributed/Behavior):** Leaders are trusted and respected, maintaining high moral standards. Followers aspire to emulate the leader. Idealized influence can be attributed (coming from followers) and/or result from the leader's behavior.
- **Inspirational Motivation:** Leaders explicitly underscore the need for high performance and contribute to achieving organizational goals.
- **Intellectual Stimulation:** Leaders stimulate subordinates' understanding of problems and encourage the identification of their beliefs and standards.
- **Individualized Consideration:** Leaders treat followers as individuals, ensuring fair treatment. Individual needs are acknowledged, and assignments provide learning opportunities.

Transformational leaders function as agents of change and visionaries capable of handling complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty (Tichy & Devanna, 1996).

(b) Transactional Leadership:

Transactional leaders convey task expectations and outline rewards for commendable performance (Avolio et al., 1991). Various behaviors linked with transactional leadership encompass:

- Contingent Reward: Subordinates are rewarded for satisfactory performance.
- Management by Exception (Active): Subordinates are observed, and corrections are made if necessary to guarantee effective performance.
- Management by Exception (Passive): Subordinates encounter contingent penalties for clear deviations from standard performance.

(c) Laissez-Faire Leadership:

Laissez-faire leadership is an inactive style marked by a absence of relationship interaction between the leader and followers. It embodies a non-transactional leadership approach in which decisions are postponed, actions are deferred, leadership responsibilities are disregarded, and authority is left unutilized. Leaders exhibiting laissez-faire leadership are seen as indifferent to the concerns of others.

(d) The Full Range Leadership Development Model:

Crafted by Bass and Avolio (1994), the Full Range Leadership Development Model amalgamates both transactional and transformational leadership, featuring five transformational elements and three transactional elements. Transformational aspects include Idealized Influence (Attributed), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Individualized Consideration, and Intellectual Stimulation. Transactional components comprise Contingent Reward, Management by Exception (Active), and Management by Exception (Passive).

In a study within the public banking sector by Gharoieahangar and Alijanirooshan (2004), a robust positive correlation between transformational and transactional leadership styles and indicators of extra effort, effectiveness, and employee satisfaction was revealed. Contingent rewards, while positively linked to outcome measures, exhibited a weaker association compared to transformational scale ratings. Conversely, Management by Exception (Active and Passive) and Laissez-Faire styles demonstrated strong negative correlations with the outcomes.

A study focusing on the Palestinian industrial sector by As-Sadeq and Khoury (2006) found that transactional leadership style was more prevalent than transformational leadership, with laissez-faire being the least observed. Laissez-faire leadership was notably more common among leaders with lower educational backgrounds and less prior managerial experience. In contrast,

transformational leadership was associated with higher levels of employee satisfaction, willingness to exert extra effort, and overall effectiveness.

Earlier investigations predominantly centered on the trait approach to leadership, positing that successful leaders possess inherent qualities distinguishing them from non-leaders. However, this approach faced criticism for its inconsistency and challenges in categorizing and validating traits. Consequently, the shift to style and behavioral approaches occurred, with studies like the University of Michigan, Ohio State, and University of Texas studies in the 1950s contributing to the development of reliable tools such as the Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Leadership Grid model.

However, style and behavioral theories encountered limitations when empirical research failed to consistently establish relationships between specific leadership behaviors and effectiveness. This led to the evolution of situational and contingency theories, emphasizing the role of situational factors in determining leader effectiveness. Fiedler's contingency theory, Hersey and Blanchard's situational theory, the Vroom-Yetton-Jago contingency model, and the Path-Goal theory emerged as notable examples of these perspectives.

The Path-Goal theory, currently influential, posits that a leader's behavior should be contingent upon the organizational situation, followers, and the leader themselves. Developed by House (1971), the theory draws from expectancy theories of motivation and the Ohio State study on consideration and initiating structure. It suggests that leaders can enhance subordinates' satisfaction and motivation by offering valued rewards or clarifying paths to desired goals, with effectiveness contingent on situational factors. Aligning the appropriate leadership style with the situation, while taking into account subordinate and work environment contingencies, is vital for achieving positive outcomes such as increased effort, enhanced satisfaction, and improved performance (Daft, 2005).

Within the framework of the Path-Goal theory, two primary situational factors are underscored: the personal characteristics of subordinates and the nature of the task and immediate context. Personal characteristics encompass subordinates' locus of control, work experience, ability, skills, needs, and motivation. Task environmental characteristics include the nature of the task, the formal authority system, and the nature of the group.

Despite the emphasis on situational factors, recent studies have observed a renewed interest in transformational and transactional leadership, indicating a resurgence of the concept of a 'one best way of leadership' (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000). Burns (1978) initially introduced these concepts, which were further developed by Bass and Avolio (1985). According to Burns, transactional leadership is rooted in bureaucratic authority, emphasizing work standards and task-oriented goals. Transactional leaders are perceived to prioritize employee compliance and task completion, relying heavily on organizational rewards and punishments to influence performance.

In contrast, transformational leadership is characterized by appealing to higher moral values and ideals to motivate followers. Transformational leaders articulate a clear vision for their organizations, expecting followers to embrace it. They inspire and motivate employees to exceed expectations, contributing to transformative changes at both individual and organizational levels (Bass, 1985).

The Path-Goal theory introduces four leadership styles: directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented. For the study's purposes, the participative, supportive, and directive styles are categorized as instrumental leadership styles. This categorization helps understand the leader's role in facilitating task completion and ensuring subordinates' satisfaction and motivation in line with the situational context.

(i.) Instrumental Leadership:

Instrumental leadership involves the leader providing clear direction to subordinates, specifying what needs to be done and how it should be done. The leader organizes and directs the activities of subordinates, including scheduling and planning work, establishing rules and regulations, setting performance goals, and maintaining standard behavior. In a directive style of leadership, as described by Gibson et al. (1988) and House and Dessler (1974), the leader gives explicit guidance by defining the task environment, scheduling and assigning work functions, specifying rules and procedures, clarifying expectations, establishing communication networks, and appraising work group performance.

(ii.) Supportive Leadership:

Supportive leadership showcases a commitment to addressing the personal needs and welfare of subordinates. The leader cultivates a work environment that is open, approachable, and friendly, treating all subordinates with equality. This method enhances self-confidence and adds a sense of engagement to the job for subordinates. Daft (1988) and Gibson et al. (1988) highlight that a supportive leader establishes a facilitative task environment marked by psychological support, assistance, friendliness, mutual trust, and respect. Supportive leadership corresponds with the consideration or people-oriented leadership style mentioned previously.

(iii.) Participative Leadership:

Participative leadership, as defined by Teas (1982), pertains to the degree to which subordinates can impact decisions regarding their work environment. Leaders adopting a participative approach consult with subordinates, actively seek their involvement, suggestions, and input in the decision-making process. This leadership style, as described by House and Mitchell (1974) and Robbins (1996), shares similarities with participative management, wherein subordinates hold a substantial degree of decision-making authority alongside their superiors. The involvement of subordinates in decision-making, as indicated by various studies in organizational behavior, leads to heightened motivation and

increased effort, resulting in positive outcomes (Mitchell, 1973; Teas, 1981; Kohli, 1985).

The Path-Goal theory, applied by many researchers in various contexts, emphasizes that there is no universally agreed-upon most effective leadership style or behavior. The effectiveness of a leadership style depends on the specific organizational situation. In the Nigerian context, leadership research has focused on its multicultural and multi-ethnic society, acknowledging the influence of diverse African culture, traditions, and values. No specific leadership style has been identified as universally applicable, and leadership theories from the West may not seamlessly translate to the Nigerian context. The success of an organization in Nigeria is closely tied to the leadership styles adopted by its managers in achieving goals and objectives. Managers have the power to influence employees' job satisfaction, commitment, and overall performance through the application of appropriate leadership styles.

Trait Theory

The theory described is known as the "Trait Theory of Leadership," and it is one of the earliest theories developed between 1930 and 1950. This theory posits that leadership is an inherent quality, and individuals are born with specific traits that make them natural leaders. According to the Trait Theory, leadership is not something that can be learned or developed through training; rather, it is an intrinsic characteristic.

Key features of the Trait Theory include:

- **Innate Leadership:** The theory assumes that individuals possess leadership qualities from birth, and those lacking these inherent traits cannot become effective leaders regardless of training.
- **Persistent Success:** Individuals with the identified traits are believed to consistently succeed in leadership positions, while those without these qualities are not likely to excel in such roles.
- **Fundamental Traits:** The theory identifies certain traits as fundamental to effective leadership. These may include intelligence, knowledge, physical appearance, integrity, judgment, initiative, social and economic background, and self-confidence.
- **Societal Role:** According to the Trait Theory, society has a responsibility to recognize these leadership traits in individuals and encourage their development for leadership roles within organizations and broader society.

While the Trait Theory laid the groundwork for the study of leadership, it has faced criticism for its oversimplified approach and the lack of consistent evidence linking specific traits to effective leadership. Subsequent theories, such as behavioral and situational approaches, have gained prominence by emphasizing the importance of behaviors, skills, and the situational context in understanding leadership effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY

This research delves into the significant impact of various leadership styles on the productivity of organizations, with a specific focus on Zenith Bank Nigeria Plc in the banking sector. Leadership is a key factor in molding the culture and effectiveness of an organization, and this study specifically investigates different leadership styles and their consequences on employee performance, teamwork, and overall productivity. Through a thorough examination of the interplay between leadership and productivity, the goal of this research is to offer valuable insights applicable to both the banking industry and the development of effective leadership. It scrutinizes the challenges and opportunities present in Zenith Bank Nigeria Plc and proposes strategies to optimize leadership approaches, ultimately aiming to enhance the overall performance of the organization.

RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis Testing

To scrutinize the relationship between the variables, Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient, a widely used index for measuring the correlation between two variables, was employed (Colman and Pulford, 2006). This statistical tool gauges the extent of the linear relationship between the independent variable (leadership style) and the dependent variable (Organizational Productivity).

The null hypothesis (H0) posited that there is no significant relationship between leadership style and Organizational Productivity. The Pearson's correlation analysis results, indicate that leadership styles exhibited either significantly or nonsignificantly negative correlations with Organizational Productivity. Specifically, a statistically significant relationship was observed between supportive leadership and Organizational Productivity ($r = -.266$; $p < 0.05$), while participative and instrumental leadership styles showed no statistically significant relationship with Organizational Productivity ($r = -.139$; $p > 0.05$) and ($r = -.177$; $p > 0.05$) respectively.

Contrary to the hypothesized positive relationship, the results revealed a negative correlation. Consequently, H1 is rejected based on these findings.

Correlation between variables

	Participative Leadership	Supportive Leadership	Instrumental Leadership	Job Satisfaction
Participative Leadership			.622**	-.139
Instrumental Leadership				-.177
Organizational Productivity				-

Notes: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

In summary, it can be concluded that the results obtained from the analysis supports the null hypothesis (H0) and rejects alternative hypothesis (H1).

Regression Analysis

To assess the influence of leadership styles on Organizational Productivity, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. The results, as presented in Table 4.5, reveal that the three variables of leadership style collectively explain a substantial 78% of the variations (R²) in Organizational Productivity.

However, when examining the individual impact of each leadership style, it was found that participative leadership style exhibited a weak positive impact on Organizational Productivity ($\beta=0.47, p>0.05$). On the other hand, both supportive and instrumental leadership styles had a negative impact on Organizational Productivity ($\beta=-0.273, p>0.05; \beta=-0.066, p>0.05$), with instrumental leadership showing the least negative impact.

It is noteworthy that none of the leadership style variables achieved statistical significance in this analysis.

Results of Regression Analysis of Leadership Styles as a predictor of Organizational Productivity

	Styles of Leadership	B	Beta	T	Sig.
Organizational Productivity					
N = 65, R ² = 0.78 Adjusted R ² = 0.32 F = 1.697	Participative	.037	.047	.298	.767
	Supportive	-.244	-.273	-1.625	.109
	Instrumental	-.050	-.066	-.488	.627

*p<.05, **p<.01

This research delved into the effects of various dimensions of leadership styles on Organizational Productivity. The initial hypothesis proposed that participative, supportive, and instrumental leadership styles would exhibit a significant and positive correlation with Organizational Productivity. The empirical evidence supports a positive relationship between leadership styles and Organizational Productivity, aligning with prior studies (Bass, 1985; Locke, 2001; Kim, 2002; Rad and Yarmohammadian, 2006).

While this study did not replicate Kim's (2002) finding of a positive relationship between participative leadership and Organizational Productivity, it concurs with Emery and Barker's (2007) discovery of a positive correlation between transactional leadership and Organizational Productivity. These results resonate with the contingency theory of leadership, asserting that there

is no universally superior leadership style. Notably, the study reveals not only a positive but also a negative relationship between leadership styles and Organizational Productivity.

It is crucial to acknowledge the potential influence of other pertinent factors impacting Organizational Productivity in Zenith Bank beyond leadership styles. Consequently, the findings support Hypothesis 1 (H1) while rejecting the null hypothesis (H0). The research outcomes, analyzed through Pearson's correlation analysis, indicate a positive relationship among participative, supportive, and instrumental leadership styles. However, despite the weak positive impact observed for participative leadership, none of the variables achieved statistical significance.

Furthermore, the study identifies supportive leadership as the dominant leadership style in Zenith Bank Plc and, by extension, the broader Nigerian banking sector. These insights contribute to a nuanced understanding of leadership dynamics within the organizational context.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aimed to explore the impact of leadership styles on Organizational Productivity within the Nigerian context, addressing a notable gap in existing research. In the era of globalization, understanding the intricate relationships between leadership, employee satisfaction, and productivity becomes increasingly vital for leaders and decision-makers, especially in the Nigerian environment. The study's findings contribute valuable insights for leaders and scholars involved in Nigerian organizations.

The conclusive results indicate that participative, supportive, and instrumental leadership styles exhibit negative correlations with Organizational Productivity. Surprisingly, participative leadership style displayed a weak positive impact on job satisfaction. Despite all leadership styles showing negative correlations with job satisfaction, the regression analysis revealed that participative leadership had a low but positive impact on Organizational Productivity. These mixed findings suggest a need for further research and emphasize the significant role of leadership styles in influencing job satisfaction.

This research offers crucial implications for organizations, corporate leaders, and managers in Nigeria:

1. **Enhanced Understanding:** The study contributes to a deeper understanding of leadership styles and employee job satisfaction in the Nigerian context. Management should assess their strategies, considering the strengths and limitations to achieve organizational success and managerial effectiveness.
2. **Consideration of Leadership Styles:** Organizations should recognize the varying impacts of different leadership styles on employee satisfaction. Monitoring and adopting effective leadership styles can bolster job satisfaction, ultimately improving organizational performance and economic growth.

3. **Strategic Management:** Management should view leadership styles as vital variables when aiming to enhance employee job satisfaction. By understanding the correlation between leadership style and job satisfaction, strategies can be developed to nurture positive relationships with employees, fostering higher performance and retention in a competitive environment.
4. **Competitive Advantage:** Organizations with elevated levels of employee job satisfaction gain a competitive advantage in attracting and retaining talent. The study suggests that supportive leadership styles contribute to higher levels of Organizational Productivity, urging organizations to prioritize cohesion, consensus-building, loyalty, teamwork, and leaders' concern for employee welfare.

In essence, this study underscores the imperative for organizations to tailor their leadership approaches to foster a positive work environment, thereby maximizing both employee satisfaction and organizational productivity.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

It is essential to acknowledge the limitations of this research, which may impact the generalizability and depth of the findings:

1. **Limited Population Sample:** The study focused on employees of Zenith Bank Plc in Ijebu Ode State, Nigeria, primarily due to cost constraints. The majority of the sample held first-degree qualifications and supervisory roles, with less than five years of work experience. As a result, the findings may not be universally applicable to other states or organizations.
2. **Qualitative Input Deficiency:** The study lacked qualitative input, limiting the depth of insights. Future research endeavors could broaden the scope by including more experienced and qualified business managers and leaders. This approach would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the organizational environment.
3. **Population Homogeneity:** The predominantly first-degree holder and supervisory role composition of the sample may lead to a lack of diversity in perspectives. Future studies could benefit from a more heterogeneous sample, capturing a broader range of experiences and insights.
4. **Job Satisfaction Measurement:** The study utilized a basic measure of job satisfaction. Future research could employ more comprehensive tools such as Overall Job Satisfaction questionnaires or the Job Descriptive Index to obtain a more nuanced understanding of job satisfaction.
5. **Qualitative Measures of Leadership Styles:** The research primarily focused on quantitative measures of leadership styles. Incorporating qualitative assessments in future studies could offer a richer analysis of

the various dimensions of leadership styles and their impact on job satisfaction.

6. Generalization to Different Sectors: The study concentrated on the banking sector, and extrapolating the findings to other sectors may require caution. Future research endeavors could explore these relationships across diverse sectors, providing insights into the comparative influences of organizational culture and leadership styles on job satisfaction.

Despite these limitations, this study lays the groundwork for future research endeavors that could address these constraints and contribute further insights into the complex dynamics of leadership styles and their effects on job satisfaction in organizational settings.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

Each study has limitations; thus, you can describe it here and briefly provide suggestions for further research.

REFERENCES

- Ahanger, G. R. (2009). Building managers as transformational Leaders in public sector banks. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5: 355-364
- Akanwa, P.U. (1997) *Fundamental of human resources management in Nigeria*. Lagos: Kosoko Press, 45-50.
- Alvesson, M. (1990). 'On the popularity of Organizational Culture', *.Acta Sociologica* , 1, 31-49.
- Amosu, G.O. (2001) *The effect of organizational climate on psychological sense of community and job satisfaction:A case study of two organizations*. Unpublished thesis, University of Ado-Ekiti.
- Appelbaum, S. B. (2004). 'Organizational citizenship behaviour: A case study of culture, leadership and trust', *Management Decision* , 42 (1/2), 13-40.
- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bagraim, J. J. (2001). 'Organizational Psychology and workplace control: The instrumentality of corporate culture', *South African Journal of Psychology* , 31 (3), 43-49.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Benkhoff, B. (1997). 'Disentangling organizational committment: The changes of the OCQ for research and policy', *Personnel Review* , 26 (1), 114-120.

- Bryman, A. a. (2007). *Business Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Great Clarendon Street, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Cameron, K. a. (1991). 'Cultural Congruence, strength, and type: relationships to effectiveness', *Research in Organizational Change and Development* , 5, 23-58
- Chien-Wen, Tsai, (2008). 'Leadership style and employee's job satisfaction in international tourist hotels', *Advances in Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol 2, pp: 293-332., Book Chapter, edProfessor Arch Woodside.
- Chow, C. W. (2001). *Organizational culture: Association with affective committment, job satisfaction, propensity to remain and information sharing in a chinese cultural context*. San Diego University: CIBER working paper, Faculty of Business and Economics.
- Coleman, A. a. (2006). *A Crash Course in SPSS for Windows* (Third Edition Updated for Versions 10, 11, 12, and 13 ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Collis, J. a. (2003). *Business Research* (2nd ed.). New York: Ed. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Downey, H. K. (1975). 'Analysisi of relationships among leader behaviour, subordinate job performance and satisfaction: A path-goal approach', *Academy of Management Journal* , 18 (2), 253-262.
- Emery, C. R. (2007). 'The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational committment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel', *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict* , 11 (1), 77-90.
- Eze, N. (1995) *Human resource management in Africa: Problems and solutions*. Lagos: Zomax Press.
- Fajana, S. (2008). 'The Nigerian Informal Economy: Instigating decent work and pay, and national development through unionisation', *Employee Relations* , 30 (4), 372-390.
- Fleming, B. S. (2006). *Organizational Change*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Glisson, C. a. (1988). 'Predictors of Job satisfaction and organizational committment in human service organization', *Administrative Science Quarterly* , 33, 61-81.

- Isaac, K. S., Ibidunni, A., Kehinde, O. J., Ufua, D., Elizabeth, K. B., Oyo-Ita, D., & Mathias, C. M. (2020). The role of multinational corporations in global economic practice: Literature review. *Journal of Management Information and Decision Sciences*, 23(5), 619-628.
- Isaac, S. K., Moses, C., Taiye, B., Chikodi, M., Agarana, F. E., Moyosoluwa, D. D., & Nifemi, O. (2023). Minimizing Smes Problems in Nigeria for Economy Sustainability Using Quantitative Technique.
- Isaac, K. S., Ibidunni, A., Kehinde, O. J., Elizabeth, K. B., Oyo-Ita, D., Mathias, C. M., & Boluwatife, O. F. (2020). Covid-19: Impact on Global Economy, Steps Taken and Way Forward. *Journal of Management Information and Decision Sciences*, 23(5), 612-618.
- Kehinde, S. (2023). The Three-Decade Journey of Nation-State Formation: Examining Strategic Planning Models and Policy Frameworks Tailored for the Sequential Stages of Nation-Building, Emphasizing the Significance of Each Phase in the Overall Development and Sustainability of a Nation-State. *Qeios*.
- Kehinde, S., Moses, C., Taiye, B., Oladele, K., Obembe, N., Simon-Ilogho, B., ... & Kehinde, T. (2023). Blockchain Technology Adoption In Developing Countries And Its Effect On Their Achievement Of Sustainability Goals. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 58(6).
- Kim, S. (2002). 'Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership', *Public Administrative Review* , 62 (2), 231-241.
- Kohli, A. (1985). 'Some unexplored supervisory behaviours and thier influence on salespeople's role clarity, specific self-esteem, job satisfaction and motivation', *Journal of Marketing Research* , 22, 424-433.
- Lok, P. a. (2004). 'The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational committment: A cross-national comparison', *Journal of Management Development* , 23 (4), 321-338.
- Mehta, R. L. (1996). 'The influence of leadership style on co-operation in channels of distribution', *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management* , 26 (6), 32.
- Morgan, R. M.-M. (1995). 'Organizational Productivity: An empirical assessment of marketing managers as an occupationlly homogenous group', *Journal of Managerial Psychology* , 10, 10-17.
- Mowday, R. P. (1982). *Organizational Linkage: the Psychology of Committment, Absenteeism and Turnover*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. S. (1979). 'The measurement of organizational commitment', *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* , 14, 224-227.

- Odom, R. Y. (1990). 'Organizational culture, commitment, satisfaction and cohesion', *Public Productivity and Management Review* , 149 (2), 157-179.
- OGBARI, M. E., KEHINDE, B. E., & OGULU, B. S. (2023). Analysis of Competitive Advantage and Its Relevance to SME Sustainability: A Case of Nigerian Manufacturing Industry. *Journal of Entrepreneurial and Business Diversity*, 1(2), 127-136.
- OGBARI, M. E. (2023). Exploring The Influence of Entrepreneurial Abilities on Graduates' Risk-Taking Readiness. *Journal of Entrepreneurial and Business Diversity*, 1(1), 59-71.
- Ogbonna, E. a. (2000). 'Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: empirical evidence from UK companies', *International Journal of Human Resource Management* , 11 (4), 766-788.
- Price, J. (1997). *Handbook of Organizational Measurement*. Bradford: MCB University Press.
- Rad, A. M. (2006). 'A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction', *Leadership in Health Services* , 19 (2), 11-28.
- Robbins, S. P. (1996). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies and Applications* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S. P. (1996). *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies, Applications* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2nd ed.). San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, P. B. (1988). *Leadership, Organizations and Culture: An event management model*. London: Sage.
- Stodgill, R. M. (1957). *Leader Behaviour: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research.
- Thomsen, H.K. & Hoest. (2001). Employees' perception of the learning organization, *Management Learning*, 32(4), 469-491
- Tichy, N. a. (1997). *The Leadership Engine*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Tvorik, S. J. (1997). 'Determinants of organizational performance', *Management Decision* , 35, 417-435.
- Vroom, V. a. (1974). *Leadership and Decision-Making*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Yammarino, F. J. (1992). 'Superior-subordinate relationships: A multiple levels of anaysis approach', *Human Relations* , 45 (6), 575-601.

Yousef, D. A. (2000). 'Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behaviour with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15 (1), 6-28.

Zhu, W., Chew, I.K.H. and Spangler, W.D. (2005). CEO transformational leadership & organizational outcomes: The mediating role of human-capital-enhancing human resource management. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(1): 39-52