

The Evaluation of Leadership Styles and their Effects on Employee Attitude: Evidence from a Manufacturing Company in South Eastern Nigeria

Ifeanyi Emmanuel Nwogbo^a, Abdulai Alpha Jalloh^{b,*}, Laurine Chikodiri Nwosu^a, Priscillia Nkem Onyibe^c, & Jennifer Airiarebhe Aigbiremhon^d

^aDepartment of Business Administration, Cyprus International University, Nicosia, North Cyprus, Turkey

^bDirectorate of Planning, Policy and, Research, National Public Health Agency, Free town, Sierra Leone

^cDepartment of Health informatics, Faculty of Art, Design & Information Technology, George Brown College, Toronto, Canada

^dDepartment of International Relation, Cyprus International University, Nicosia, North Cyprus, Turkey

Abstract

Leadership styles are widely acknowledged as a fundamental factor in determining organizational success, influencing the performance of employees and the overall organizational culture. How leaders manage their teams can greatly impact employee attitudes, motivation, and behaviours, affecting productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. This quantitative study employed data collected from 373 staff members at a Manufacturing Company in Southeast Nigeria using an online survey. The data collected was analyzed using SPSS version 20. Correlation and regression analyzes were conducted to test the relationship and impact among the variables. The findings highlighted the positive influence of democratic, transactional, autocratic, and transformational leadership on employee attitude. Furthermore, significant values were obtained for the correlation and effect between the constructs ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, adopting a multiple approach is recommended in leadership, rather than a singular style when dealing with employees in an organization.

Keywords: Employee attitude; Democratic leadership; Transactional leadership; Autocratic leadership; Transformational leadership.

Received: 4 January 2024

Revised: 13 April 2024

Accepted: 20 June 2024

1. Introduction

Leadership styles are widely acknowledged as a fundamental factor in determining organizational success, influencing the performance of employees and the overall organizational culture. How leaders manage their teams can greatly impact employee attitudes, motivation, and behaviours, affecting productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Cooper & Cartwright, 2018). In today's rapidly evolving business landscape, where competition is fierce and market demands constantly change, especially in manufacturing industries, effective leadership is more critical than ever (Ezeador & Okpara 2023; Cote, 2017). Organizations with strong leadership are better positioned to achieve long-term success, while those with weak leadership structures may struggle with low employee morale, high turnover, and decreased productivity (Paais & Pattiruhu, 2020).

The concept of leadership encompasses various styles, each with distinct characteristics and effects on the workforce. Leadership styles range from autocratic, where leaders make decisions unilaterally, to more democratic and participatory styles that encourage input and collaboration from employees (Belkin et al., 2020). Transformational leadership, which inspires and motivates employees by aligning their goals with the broader organizational vision, has gained prominence as an effective approach to fostering a positive work environment. These varying styles can have profound effects on employee attitudes and behaviour, determining how employees perceive their roles, how engaged they are with their work, and how committed they feel to the organization's goals (Lussier, et al., 2017). Leadership is

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: jayjalloh33@gmail.com

not merely a matter of authority but involves the ability to influence, inspire, and guide employees toward achieving collective objectives.

In the manufacturing sector, where operational efficiency, innovation, and quality control are essential, leadership becomes even more significant (Malik and Azmat, 2019). In many emerging economies, including Nigeria, the manufacturing sector plays a vital role in driving economic growth and providing employment opportunities. However, the sector faces numerous challenges, including outdated leadership practices, poor communication between management and employees, and inconsistent organizational strategies. These challenges are exacerbated in regions such as South Eastern Nigeria, where manufacturing industries have historically been crucial to economic development but have faced ongoing struggles related to leadership and employee relations (Iszatt-White & Saunders, 2017).

Employees are fundamental to achieving organizational goals, and their actions, whether positive or negative, directly impact business outcomes (Paais & Pattiruhu, 2020). Leadership behaviour, particularly how leaders communicate with their teams, significantly affects employee performance and attitude. Hannah et al. (2020) noted that leadership communication plays a critical role in shaping team behaviour. When leadership is ineffective, organizations may face challenges such as lack of innovation, poor service delivery, failure to meet financial obligations, and issues related to dishonesty. These problems can severely undermine organizational performance and sustainability.

In the Nigerian business context, unethical practices and lack of transparency have weakened employee trust in management, often resulting in negative perceptions of leadership. This erosion of trust can lead to diminished employee engagement and reduced organizational effectiveness (Ibrahim and Daniel, 2019). In companies with poor leadership styles, employees may feel disconnected from organizational objectives, leading to suboptimal performance and lower levels of job satisfaction. Understanding how different leadership styles influence employee attitudes is essential to addressing these issues and fostering positive workplace environments.

This study aims to evaluate the effects of various leadership styles on employee attitude, with a particular focus on the manufacturing sector. By investigating this relationship, the research seeks to provide insights that can inform leadership development and organizational strategies aimed at enhancing employee engagement, satisfaction, and overall performance.

2. Literature Review

A significant amount of empirical research has shown how leadership styles impact worker performance, with good leaders encouraging performance and bad leaders encouraging underperformance. The present business environment requires a kind of creative leadership to ensure the survival of the company and increase organizational performance; a style that empowers staff, inspires them, recognizes their contributions, and raises employee performance (Addin, 2020). However, it has been shown through research from a variety of sources that when compared to transactional leaders, transformational leaders have a bigger impact on their team members, including the private, public, and nonprofit sectors as well as the armed forces of Germany, Canada, the United States, China, and India (Maritz, 2021). Transformative leadership exudes optimism and has high expectations for followers' performance and greatness. It also fosters teamwork, self-motivation, and result-oriented behaviour. Additionally, it is said that a transactional leadership style might help employees perform at a greater level than they typically would (DeArmond, 2018). According to recent studies from the world of business, transformational leadership and employee performance are positively correlated (Buil et al., 2019). Therefore, it is anticipated that both transactional and transformational leadership will directly improve employee performance. The association between transactional, laissez-faire, and authoritarian leadership styles and worker performance is demonstrated linearly by this. It does not, however, demonstrate the connection between the transactional, autocratic, laissez-faire, and transformational leadership styles. However, studies conducted by Ünler and Kılıç (2019) and Khuwaja, et al. (2020) included affective commitment as a means to measure employee attitude. Hence, the decision to include the construct in the present research.

3. Methods

3.1. Measures

The quantitative study explores the evaluation of leadership styles and their effect on employee attitude. Transactional leadership style was measured using 8 items, transformational leadership style was measured using 8 items, democratic leadership style was measured using 8 items, autocratic leadership style was measured using 7 items, and laissez-faire leadership was also measured using 6 items. The survey instrument used was adopted from the Multi-Factor Leadership

Questionnaire (MLQ) which was developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) and then modified to suit the context of the study. Employee attitude was measured using 6 items adopted by Ünler and Kılıç (2019). The constructs were measured using a 5-point scoring scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). All items were reliable and valid after appropriate tests were conducted.

3.2. Research Population

The study population includes senior and junior staff aged 18 years and above who work at Innoson Vehicle Manufacturing Company Nnewi, Anambra State, Nigeria. At the time of the study, 373 employees were working at the organization which formed the research population.

3.3. Data Collection

The survey distribution and data collection were conducted online via Google Forms; the link was distributed to the participants. The survey link was distributed to all 373 participants through the assistance of the Human resource manager. After the data collection period (3 weeks) had elapsed, 270 responses were retrieved. However, 5 responses were deleted due to missing information (71.0% response rate).

3.4. Data Analysis

Data was analysed using SPSS version 20. Descriptive statistics was performed for all study variables including means, standard deviations, and percentages. Cronbach's alpha values were generated to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. Factor loading values were also generated to check the validity of items. A correlation analysis was performed to check the relationship among the constructs. A logistic regression analysis was performed to test the research hypotheses.

3.5. Ethical Approach

A description of the states of participation in the survey and the terms for withdrawal were provided towards the start of the survey instrument, along with an explanation of why the information was being gathered. Additionally, participants were notified that the responses provided will remain anonymous and that the data will only be used for research purposes.

4. Result and Discussions

4.1. Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents

A total of 265 employees provided valid responses. Most of the respondents were between 46-55 years which accounted for 24.2% while those of 66 years and above (6%) accounted for the least. Over half of the participants were females while 41.1% were males. Most respondents were married (53.2%) while 7.9% were divorced/separated. Most participants had up to tertiary level of education (46.0%) with working experience between 0-5 years (67.5%).

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age groups	47	
18 – 25 years	45	17.7
26 – 35 years	57	17.0
36 – 45years	64	21.5
46 – 55years	36	24.2
56 – 65years	16	13.6
66 years and above	265	6.0
Total		100.0

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	109	41.1
Female	156	58.9
Total	265	100.0
Marital status		
Single	71	26.8
Married	141	53.2
Divorced/separated	21	7.9
Widowed	32	12.1
Total	365	100.0
Educational level		
None	14	5.3
Primary	16	6.0
Middle	8	3.0
Secondary	30	11.3
Vocational	75	28.3
Tertiary	122	46.0
Total	265	100.0
Work experience		
0 – 5 years	179	
6 – 10 years	55	67.5
11 – 15 years	31	20.8
Total	265	11.7
		100.0

4.2. Analysis of Factors Influencing Employee Attitude

Table 2 revealed that the majority of the respondents were satisfied with the transactional leadership style. However, the minority of the respondents showed a negative attitude towards the leadership style. As seen in Table 3 positive responses were generally received towards the Transformational Leadership Style relating to motivation from supervisors in identifying organizational goals and interests., encouragement towards creativity and new ideas to solve problems, supervisor paying attention to the employees’ individual needs for growth and performance improvement. Table 4 shows that most respondents agreed that their supervisor has a good relationship with the employees (40.0%). Most of the respondents agreed that their supervisor's leadership style is based on participation (60.8%), while 19.6% of the respondents strongly disagreed, that their supervisor delegates authority to other employees and lets them make their own decisions. However, there was a generally positive response as regards the democratic leadership style. Responses were generally negative towards evaluating the autocratic leadership style and employee attitude as shown in Table 5. In addition, the Laissez-faire leadership style in Table 6, showed a general negative response from the respondents. The majority of respondents strongly disagreed that their manager provides freedom to people under his control in doing their tasks (53.2%). It was also found that the majority of participants (44.5%) strongly disagreed that their manager frees people to have job rotation and allows them to circulate in different occupations. Also, 48.3% of respondents strongly disagreed that their manager allows employees themselves adjust the speed of their work. The result of the evaluation based on the employee attitude as shown in Table 7 showed that the majority of the respondents when asked, revealed that they would be very happy to spend the rest of their career with this organization and feel as if the organization’s problems are theirs. However, there was a negative response (69.8%) from the respondents when asked if they felt a strong sense of belonging to the organization. Furthermore, the majority of participants strongly disagreed that they do not feel “emotionally attached” to the organization (61.5%). The Table also showed that 65.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed, that they do not feel like are part of the “family” at the organization.

Table 2. Transactional Leadership Style

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
TRSAC1	8	3.0		
	9	3.4	4.26	.935

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
TRSAC2	15	5.7	4.35	.739
	108	40.8		
	125	47.2		
	2	.8		
	6	2.3		
	12	4.5		
TRSAC3	122	46.0	4.25	.882
	123	46.4		
	3	1.1		
	11	4.2		
	27	10.2		
	100	37.7		
TRSAC4	124	46.8	4.32	.830
	6	2.3		
	1	.4		
	23	8.7		
	107	40.4		
	128	48.3		
TRSAC5	4	1.5	4.41	.779
	2	.8		
	18	6.8		
	98	37.0		
	143	54.0		
	3	1.1		
TRSAC6	11	4.2	4.22	.863
	25	9.4		
	113	42.6		
	113	42.6		
	8	3.0		
	1	.4		
TRSAC7	16	6.0	4.31	.851
	115	43.4		
	125	47.2		
	67	25.3		
	92	34.7		
	106	40.0		
TRSAC8	106	40.0	2.15	.796
	-	-		
	-	-		

Table 3. Transformational Leadership Style

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
TRF1	3	1.1	4.45	.717
	3	1.1		
	8	3.0		
	109	41.1		
	142	53.6		
TRF2	1	.4	4.45	.711
	5	1.9		
	13	4.9		
	102	38.5		
	144	54.3		
TRF3	2	.8		

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
TRF4	2	.8	4.49	.669
	8	3.0		
	104	39.2		
	149	56.2		
	3	1.1		
TRF5	3	1.1	4.43	.751
	15	5.7		
	101	38.1		
	143	54.0		
	1	.4		
TRF6	5	1.9	4.44	.705
	12	4.5		
	106	40.0		
	141	53.2		
	2	.8		
TRF7	5	1.9	4.42	.755
	16	6.0		
	98	37.0		
	144	54.3		
	2	.8		
TRF8	2	.8	4.40	.732
	21	7.9		
	103	38.9		
	137	51.7		
	3	1.1		
	-	-	4.45	.748
	23	8.7		
	88	33.2		
	151	57.0		

Table 4. Democratic Leadership Style

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
DEM1	13	4.9	4.26	.982
	3	1.1		
	15	5.7		
	106	40.0		
DEM2	128	48.3	4.00	1.489
	38	14.3		
	18	6.8		
	10	3.8		
DEM3	38	14.3	3.20	1.345
	161	60.8		
	52	19.6		
	27	10.2		
DEM4	38	14.3	4.18	1.085
	113	42.6		
	35	13.2		
	6	2.3		
	21	7.9	4.18	1.085
	37	14.0		

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
DEM5	57	21.5	4.22	1.101
	144	54.3		
	6	2.3		
	26	9.8		
	23	8.7		
DEM6	58	21.9	4.17	1.121
	152	57.4		
	5	1.9		
	30	11.3		
	27	10.2		
DEM7	55	20.8	4.20	1.066
	148	55.8		
	2	.8		
	29	10.9		
	30	11.3		
DEM8	58	21.9	3.85	1.293
	146	55.1		
	27	10.2		
	18	6.8		
	27	10.2		
	88	33.2		
	105	39.6		
	18	6.8		

Table 5. Autocratic Leadership Style

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
AUTO1	145	54.7	1.88	1.184
	53	20.0		
	33	12.5		
	22	8.3		
AUTO2	12	4.5	1.94	1.052
	113	42.6		
	87	32.8		
	40	15.1		
AUTO3	17	6.4	2.06	1.163
	8	3.0		
	111	41.9		
	73	27.5		
AUTO4	49	18.5	1.98	1.143
	18	6.8		
	14	5.3		
	125	47.2		
AUTO5	60	22.6	1.98	1.145
	50	18.9		
	20	7.5		
	10	3.8		
	120	45.3		
	73	27.5		
	44	16.6		
	14	5.3		

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
AUTO6	14	5.3	1.90	1.131
	134	50.6		
	63	23.8		
	37	14.0		
	22	8.3		
AUTO7	9	3.4	1.91	1.092
	130	49.1		
	64	24.2		
	44	16.6		
	20	7.5		
	7	2.6		

Table 6. Laissez Faire Leadership Style

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
LF1	141	53.2	1.90	1.181
	56	21.1		
	34	12.8		
	22	8.3		
	12	4.5		
LF2	113	42.6	1.94	1.056
	87	32.8		
	41	15.5		
	15	5.7		
LF3	9	3.4	2.08	1.160
	107	40.4		
	76	28.7		
	51	19.2		
	16	6.0		
LF4	15	5.7	2.01	1.121
	118	44.5		
	65	24.5		
	53	20.0		
	20	7.5		
LF5	9	3.4	2.01	1.146
	115	43.4		
	75	28.3		
	46	17.4		
	15	5.7		
LF6	14	5.3	1.93	1.124
	128	48.3		
	68	25.7		
	38	14.3		
	22	8.3		
	9	3.4		
	12	4.4		

4.3. Validity and Reliability Test

The results in Table 8 reveal the validity and reliability of the constructs under study. As recommended by Gupta and Falk (2017), a significant benchmark of 0.5 was established to acquire a significant value for the factor loadings. Until the suggested loadings were achieved, extraction values below 0.5 were eliminated one at a time. After calculating the internal consistency, the reliability values were found to be higher than the 0.5 criterion recommended by Khidzir et al. (2018).

4.4. Correlation Analysis

The analysis represented in Table 9 showed the relationship among the constructs. The findings met the criteria for conducting regression analysis.

Table 7. Employee Attitude

Questions	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	SD
EA1	6	2.3	4.15	1.014
	18	6.8		
	29	10.9		
	90	34.0		
	122	46.0		
EA2	8	3.0	4.14	1.027
	15	5.7		
	30	11.3		
	90	34.0		
	122	46.0		
EA3	185	69.8	1.68	1.208
	29	10.9		
	14	5.3		
	24	9.1		
	13	4.9		
EA4	163	61.5	1.74	1.159
	51	19.2		
	20	7.5		
	18	6.8		
	13	4.9		
EA5	174	65.7	1.74	1.215
	38	14.3		
	16	6.0		
	23	8.7		
	14	5.3		
EA6	5	1.9	4.15	1.124
	31	11.7		
	27	10.2		
	59	22.3		
	143	54.0		

4.5. Hypothesis Testing

For this study, regression analysis was conducted to test the research hypotheses. Regression is a method for determining the strength of the association between one dependent variable and independent variables (Schneider et al., 2010). It enables a researcher to predict the impact the independent variable has on the dependent variable. The items of each variable were computed to obtain the mean value. The values were employed for the analysis as seen in Table 8.

Table 8. Validity and Reliability

Variable	Indicator	Factor loadings	Cronbach's α
Transactional Leadership style	TRSAC1	.547	.852
Transformational Leadership style	TRSAC2	.546	
	TRSAC3	.722	
	TRSAC4	.700	
	TRSAC5	.588	
	TRSAC6	.660	
			.941

Variable	Indicator	Factor loadings	Cronbach's α
Democratic Leadership style	TRSAC7	.675	.833
	TRAC8	.880	
	TRF 1	.750	
	TRF 2	.814	
	TRF 3	.858	
	TRF 4	.857	
	TRF 5	.747	
	TRF 8	.636	
	DEM 3	.896	
	DEM 4	.907	
Autocratic Leadership style	DEM 5	.804	.613
	DEM 6	.828	
	DEM 7	.559	
	AUTO 1	.637	
	AUTO 2	.778	
	AUTO 3	.593	
Laisse Faire Leadership style	AUTO 4	.661	.890
	AUTO 5	.614	
	AUTO 6	.720	
	LF 1	.778	
	LF 2	.591	
	LF 3	.619	
Employee Attitude	LF 4	.597	.747
	LF 5	.599	
	LF 6	.695	
	EA 1	.809	
	EA 2	.815	
	EA 3	.931	
	EA 5	.880	
	EA 6	.915	

4.6. Discussion

Leaders are those who make significant contributions to developing accommodating and supportive working environments (Litano & Major, 2016). Optimal employee attitude can occur only if the leaders at an organization are able to manage its employees into reliable human resources (Waldan, 2020). The multifaceted nature of an organization operation necessitates efficient involvement from all levels of the organization. Besides having access to land, labour, and capital, human resource is a vital component of the organization, playing an essential part in ensuring the smooth operation of the organization and accomplishing its goals (Malik, 2019). According to Qolo (2018), a more human-oriented leadership style tends to boost employee work attitude. Employees are more satisfied with their jobs when their superiors support and recognize them. The findings of the study showed a significant relationship between transactional leadership and employee attitude which similar to the findings by Purwanto et al. (2020).

The results obtained in the second hypothesis align with prior studies conducted across various cultures within both public and private sectors, indicating that transformative leadership positively influences engagement. It enhances aspects of employee performance, like latent rewards, contingencies, or disciplinary measures, resulting in improved emotional, continuous, and normative engagement (Shields & Johns, 2016; Shin et al., 2017; Thanh & Quang 2020; Gathungu et al., 2015).

As expected, democratic leadership style was shown to have a significant effect on employees' attitude. A study by Chukwusa (2019) reached similar conclusions and demonstrated that democratic leadership improves employee attitude. Also, other researchers concluded in their research that democratic leadership styles promote employee morale, and thus their voluntary behaviour improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization (Fiaz et al., 2017). Democratic leadership generates elevated employee contentment, collaboration, and dedication. It diminishes the

necessity for supervision, formal regulations, and protocols, thereby leading to decreased employee absenteeism and turnover (Hilton et al., 2021).

Table 9. Correlation among Constructs

		Correlations					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
TRA (1)	Pearson Correlation	1	.721**	.534**	.264**	-.280**	.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.327
	N	265	265	265	265	265	265
TRF (2)	Pearson Correlation	.721**	1	.516**	.286**	-.297**	.108
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.079
	N	265	265	265	265	265	265
DEM (3)	Pearson Correlation	.534**	.516**	1	.356**	-.401**	-.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.783
	N	265	265	265	265	265	265
AUT (4)	Pearson Correlation	.264**	.286**	.356**	1	-.929**	-.645**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	265	265	265	265	265	265
LF (5)	Pearson Correlation	-.280**	-.297**	-.401**	-.929**	1	.710**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	265	265	265	265	265	265
EA (6)	Pearson Correlation	.060	.108	-.017	-.645**	.710**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.327	.079	.783	.000	.000	
	N	265	265	265	265	265	265

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

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

Table 10. Regression Analysis

Path	Coefficient	p-value	Decision
Transactional leadership - employees' attitude		.371	.000 Supported
Transformational leadership- employees' attitude		.400	.000 Supported
Democratic leadership- employees' attitude		.530	.000 Supported
Autocratic leadership- employees' attitude		.896	.000 Supported
Laissez-faire leadership- employees' attitude		-.878	.000 Supported

*Note: p value is significant at p<0.05

The result observed in the fourth hypothesis revealed a significant association. Findings by Caillier (2020) supported the findings of the present study. Contrary to the present findings, Luqman et al. (2020) revealed a significant but negative relationship between autocratic leadership style and employee commitment. The findings also showed that the decreased level of employee commitment increase the tendency of employees to engage in counterproductive working behaviours. Basit et al. (2017) revealed a negative and significant relationship between autocratic leadership style and employee performance among workers in private companies in Malaysia. Kalu and Okpokwasili (2018) also discovered that autocratic leadership had a negative substantial impact on employee attitude.

The findings of the fifth hypothesis are consistent with that of Veliu et al. (2017) which showed that laissez-faire leadership style has a detrimental impact on employee attitude. Silva and Mendis (2017) also revealed a negative and significant impact of Laissez-faire leadership style and employee commitment. The absence of guidance, support, and direction from laissez-faire leaders results in employees feeling disconnected and unsure about their positions within the organization. When communication and feedback are unclear or lacking, employees face challenges in grasping what is expected, causing a decline in their drive and involvement (Al Rahbi et al., 2017). Laissez-faire leadership approach creates an atmosphere of uncertainty, potentially making employees feel marginalized and unrecognized, thereby diminishing their emotional connection and loyalty to the organization. The lack of active leadership participation obstructs the formation of a unified vision, diminishing employees' allegiance and commitment to the company's objectives and principles (Zill et al., 2020).

Every organization has a specified set of targets and desires to achieve. To attain these goals, strong leadership demonstrated by management is critical in creating a positive working environment for employees. It is recommended

that executives select the most effective leadership style that relates with their staff and prioritize its implementation. This strategic strategy is critical for developing future strategies and accomplishing the organization's goals. Leaders should also encourage transparency and open communication with their workforce. Emphasizing the importance of listening to employees' problems, providing constructive criticism, and incorporating them in decision-making processes fosters an inclusive environment that improves employee attitudes. Establishing systems for continuous feedback and assessing leadership performance is critical. Regular assessments, such as employee sentiment surveys and performance reviews, allow executives to fine-tune their strategies and address any shortcomings proactively.

5. Conclusions

Leadership has a tremendous impact on individual, group, and organizational work performance. Effective leadership necessitates everyday decisions based on many leadership techniques, emphasizing the significance of leaders' sensitivity and comprehension. The findings revealed that democratic, transactional, autocratic, and transformational leadership all had a positive impact on employee attitudes. Each leadership style is a unique combination of behaviors and leadership characteristics. For quick responses and immediate actions, the autocratic style proves efficient, particularly in undisciplined or poorly organized groups; the democratic style thrives in well-organized and stable groups, supporting productivity through staff involvement in decision-making processes; transactional leadership emphasizes the communication between managers and subordinates, emphasizing the use of rewards, punishments, and clear structures to motivate and guide employees.

Acknowledgements

The quantitative research method frequently employs a standardized questionnaire with closed-ended questions, potentially limiting the variety of findings. The study's findings may not fully depict broader occurrences because respondents were constrained in their response options. To gain a thorough knowledge of the current study, future studies should use a mixed-methods approach. The current study used one of the manufacturing industries in Anambra State, Nigeria; future studies could be conducted in other manufacturing industries in other states of the country to generalize the results.

References

- Abdelmoula, M., Chakroun, W., & Akrouf, F. (2015). The effect of sample size and the number of items on reliability coefficients: Alpha and rho: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Numerical Methods and Applications*, 13(1), 1-20.
- Adamopoulos, I. P. (2022). Job satisfaction in public health care sector, measures scales and theoretical background. *European Journal of Environment and Public Health*, 6(2), em0116.
- Addin, N. A. H. T. (2020). The relationship between the leadership and organizational performance a review. *International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology*, 7(11), 120-128.
- Al Harbi, J. A., Alarifi, S., & Mosbah, A. (2019). Transformation leadership and creativity: Effects of employees psychological empowerment and intrinsic motivation. *Personnel Review*, 48(5), 1082-1099.
- Al Rahbi, D., Khalid, K., & Khan, M. (2017). The effects of leadership styles on team motivation.
- Alanazi, T. R., Alharthey, B. K., & Rasli, A. (2013). Overview of path-goal leadership theory. *Sains Humanika*, 64(2).
- Alanazi, T. R., Alharthey, B. K., & Rasli, A. (2013). Overview of path-goal leadership theory. *Sains Humanika*, 64(2).
- Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). An empirical study of employees' motivation and its influence job satisfaction. *Ali, B.J, & Anwar, G.(2021). An Empirical Study of Employees' Motivation and its Influence Job Satisfaction. International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 5(2), 21-30.
- Altheeb, S. A. (2020). Leadership Style and Employee Motivation: A Study of Saudi Arabian Work Environment. *Journal of Educational Psychology-Propositos y Representaciones*, 8.

- Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). A review of leadership theories, principles and styles and their relevance to educational management. *Management*, 5(1), 6-14.
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M., & Kuchinke, K. P. (2016). Impact of leadership styles on employees' attitude towards their leader and performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistani banks. *Future Business Journal*, 2(1), 54-64.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The leadership quarterly*, 6(2), 199-218.
- Basar, Z. M., Mansor, A. N., & Hamid, A. H. A. (2021). The role of transformational leadership in addressing job satisfaction issues among secondary school teachers. *Creative Education*, 12(8), 1939-1948.
- Basit, A., Sebastian, V., & Hassan, Z. (2017). Impact of leadership style on employee performance (A Case study on a private organization in Malaysia). *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, 5(2), 112-130.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2010). The transformational model of leadership. *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era*, 2(1), 76-86.
- Belkin, L. Y., Becker, W. J., & Conroy, S. A. (2020). The invisible leash: The impact of organizational expectations for email monitoring after-hours on employee resources, well-being, and turnover intentions. *Group & Organization Management*, 45(5), 709-740.
- Belsky, J. (2017). *A Quantitative Examination of the Relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Job Satisfaction in Registered Nurses in the Pittsburgh MSA Region*. Liberty University.
- Bowers, E. K. A. (2019). Transformational Leadership An Analysis of Effects on Employee Well-Being. *Journal of Integrated Studies*, 11(1).
- Brahim, A. B., Ridic, O., & Jukic, T. (2015). The effect of transactional leadership on employees performance-case study of 5 Algerian banking institutions. *Economic Review: Journal of Economics and Business*, 13(2), 7-20.
- Buil, I., Martínez, E., & Matute, J. (2019). Transformational leadership and employee performance: The role of identification, engagement and proactive personality. *International journal of hospitality management*, 77, 64-75.
- Burns Jr, W. A. (2017). A Descriptive Literature Review of Harmful Leadership Styles: Definitions, Commonalities, Measurements, Negative Impacts, and Ways to Improve These Harmful Leadership Styles. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, 3(1), 33-52.
- Burns, H., Diamond-Vaught, H., & Bauman, C. (2015). Leadership for sustainability: Theoretical foundations and pedagogical practices that foster change. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*.
- Caillier, J. G. (2020). Testing the influence of autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, and public service motivation on citizen ratings of an agency head's performance. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 43(4), 918-941.
- Charter, R. A. (2003). Study samples are too small to produce sufficiently precise reliability coefficients. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 130(2), 117-129.
- Chukwusa, J. (2018). Autocratic leadership style: Obstacle to success in academic libraries. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1.
- Chukwusa, J. (2019). Perceived democratic leadership style of university librarians and library staff work attitude. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 0_1-23.
- Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S. (2018). Healthy Mind; Healthy Organization—A Proactive Approach to Occupational Stress 1. In *Managerial, occupational and organizational stress research* (pp. 595-611). Routledge.
- Copeland, M. K. (2014). The emerging significance of values based leadership: A literature review. *International journal of leadership studies*, 8(2), 105.
- Cote, R. (2017). Vision of effective leadership. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 8(6), 1-10.
- DeArmond, S., Bass, B. I., Cigularov, K. P., Chen, P., & Moore, J. T. (2018). Leadership and safety: The role of goal commitment. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 5(2), 182-198.

- Ejimabo, N. O. (2015). The influence of decision making in organizational leadership and management activities. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Organization Management*, 4(2), 2222-2839.
- Erenel, F. (2015). The effect of path-goal leadership styles on work group performance: A research on jewellery industry in Istanbul. *Journal of Management Marketing and Logistics*, 2(4).
- Ezeador, C. N., & Okpara, G. C. (2023). PHILOSOPHY AS A PANACEA FOR BUILDING RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP FOR STRONG EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN NIGERIA. *PHILOSOPHIA POLITICA*, 2(1).
- Fiaz, M., Su, Q., Ikram, A., & Saqib, A. (2017). LEADERSHIP STYLES AND EMPLOYEES' MOTIVATION: PERSPECTIVE FROM AN EMERGING ECONOMY. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 51(4), 143-156.
- Gathungu, E. W., Iravo, D. M. A., & Namusonge, G. S. (2015). Transformational leadership and employee's commitment: empirical review. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 20(7), 1-7.
- Grint, K., Jones, O. S., Holt, C., & Storey, J. (2016). What is leadership? *The Routledge companion to leadership*, 3-20.
- Hamidifar, F. (2010). A study of the relationship between leadership styles and employee job satisfaction at IAU in Tehran, Iran. *Au-GSB e-Journal*, 3(1).
- Hamstra, M. R., Van Yperen, N. W., Wisse, B., & Sassenberg, K. (2014). Transformational and transactional leadership and followers' achievement goals. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29, 413-425.
- Hannah, S. T., Perez, A. L., Lester, P. B., & Quick, J. C. (2020). Bolstering workplace psychological well-being through transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(3), 222-240.
- Haryanto, H., Suharman, H., Koeswayo, P. S., & Umar, H. (2022). Enhancing Employee Engagement in Indonesian Logistics and Forwarders Industry: The Moderating Role of a Democratic Leadership Style. *Economies*, 10(11), 284.
- Henkel, T. G., Marion Jr, J. W., & Bourdeau, D. T. (2019). Project manager leadership behavior: Task-oriented versus relationship-oriented. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 18(2), 1.
- Hilton, S. K., Arkorful, H., & Martins, A. (2021). Democratic leadership and organizational performance: the moderating effect of contingent reward. *Management Research Review*, 44(7), 1042-1058.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*, 321-339.
- House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1975). *Path goal theory of leadership* (pp. 75-67). Faculty of Management Studies, University of Toronto.
- Ibrahim, A. U., & Daniel, C. O. (2019). Impact of leadership on organisational performance. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Research*, 6(2), 367-374.
- Iszatt-White, M., & Saunders, C. (2017). *Leadership*. Oxford University Press.
- Kalu Dolly, C., & Okpokwasili Nonyelum, P. (2018). Impact of autocratic leadership style on job performance of subordinates in academic libraries in port harcourt, rivers state, nigeria. *International Journal of Research-Granthaalayah*, 6(10), 212-220.
- Khuwaja, U., Ahmed, K., Abid, G., Adeel, A., & Wanasika, I. (2020). Leadership and employee attitudes: The mediating role of perception of organizational politics. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7 (1), 1â€“21.
- Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2020). Empowering leadership: leading people to be present through affective organizational commitment?. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(16), 2017-2044.
- Lahiri, K., Indrasena, B. S. H., & Aylott, J. (2021). Unprecedented times in the emergency department: are "board rounds" and leadership the missing links to improve patient flow?. *Leadership in Health Services*, 35(1), 74-90.
- Lewin, M. A. (2014). Kurt Lewin: His psychology and a daughter's recollections. In *Portraits of pioneers in psychology* (pp. 105-118). Psychology Press.
- Li, Z., Gupta, B., Loon, M., & Casimir, G. (2016). Combinative aspects of leadership style and emotional intelligence. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(1), 107-125.

- Litano, M. L., & Major, D. A. (2016). Facilitating a whole-life approach to career development: The role of organizational leadership. *Journal of Career Development*, 43(1), 52-65.
- Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 434.
- Luqman, R., Fatima, S., Ahmed, S., Khalid, I., & Bhatti, A. (2020). The impact of autocratic leadership style on counterproductive work behavior: the mediating role of employee commitment and moderating role of emotional exhaustion. *Pollster Journal of Academic Research*, 6(01), 22-47.
- Lussier, B., Grégoire, Y., & Vachon, M. A. (2017). The role of humor usage on creativity, trust and performance in business relationships: An analysis of the salesperson-customer dyad. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 65, 168-181.
- Malik, A. (2019). Creating competitive advantage through source basic capital strategic humanity in the industrial age 4.0. *International Research Journal of Advanced Engineering and Science*, 4(1), 209-215.
- Malik, M. A., & Azmat, S. (2019). Leader and leadership: Historical development of the terms and critical review of literature. *Annals of the University of Craiova for Journalism, Communication and Management*, 5(1), 16-32.
- Malik, S. H. (2013). Relationship between leader behaviors and employees' job satisfaction: A path-goal approach. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 7(1), 209-222.
- Manoppo, V. P. (2020). Transformational leadership as a factor that decreases turnover intention: a mediation of work stress and organizational citizenship behavior. *The TQM journal*, 32(6), 1395-1412.
- Maritz, M. (2021). *Power in poverty: congregational leadership in a context of poverty* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State).
- Martin, W. (2018). *Leadership: Outdated theories and emerging non-traditional leadership* (Doctoral dissertation, Northcentral University).
- Mohajan, H. K. (2017). Two criteria for good measurements in research: Validity and reliability. *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, 17(4), 59-82.
- Nabella, S. D., Rivaldo, Y., Kurniawan, R., Nurmayunita, N., Sari, D. P., Luran, M. F., & Wulandari, K. (2022). The Influence of Leadership and Organizational Culture Mediated by Organizational Climate on Governance at Senior High School in Batam City. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(5), 119-130.
- Paais, M., & Pattiruhu, J. R. (2020). Effect of motivation, leadership, and organizational culture on satisfaction and employee performance. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 577-588.
- Parra, Y. D. (2019). *US Workers' Compensation Program: Policy Issues and State Impact* (Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne).
- Purwanto, A., Bernarto, I., Asbari, M., Wijayanti, L. M., & Hyun, C. C. (2020). Effect of transformational and transactional leadership style on public health centre performance. *Journal of Research in Business, Economics, and Education*, 2(1).
- Putnam, H. (1966). What theories are not. In *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics* (Vol. 44, pp. 240-251). Elsevier.
- Qolo, M. W. (2018). *The impact of people-focused leadership style on employee performance in project-based industries in the Cape Metropole* (Doctoral dissertation, Cape Peninsula University of Technology).
- Raza, S. A., & Sikandar, A. (2018). Impact of leadership style of teacher on the performance of students: An application of Hersey and Blanchard situational model. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 40(3), 73-94.
- Rojas, M., Méndez, A., & Watkins-Fassler, K. (2023). The hierarchy of needs empirical examination of Maslow's theory and lessons for development. *World Development*, 165, 106185.
- Shields, J., & Johns, R. (2016). Managing for engagement. *Managing employee performance & reward: Concepts, practices, strategies*, 18-52.

- Shin, S. J., Yuan, F., & Zhou, J. (2017). When perceived innovation job requirement increases employee innovative behavior: A sensemaking perspective. *Journal of Organizational behavior*, 38(1), 68-86.
- Sibonde, A. H., & Dassah, M. O. (2021). The relationship between employee motivation and service quality: Case study of a selected municipality in the Western Cape province, South Africa. *Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review*, 9(1), 12.
- Silva, S., & Mendis, B. A. K. M. (2017). Relationship between transformational, transaction and laissez-faire leadership styles and employee commitment. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 9(7), 13-21.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (2017). How to choose a leadership pattern. In *Leadership perspectives* (pp. 75-84). Routledge.
- Thanh, N. H., & Quang, N. V. (2022). Transformational, transactional, laissez-faire leadership styles and employee engagement: Evidence from Vietnam's public sector. *Sage Open*, 12(2), 21582440221094606.
- Tzenios, N. (2019). The Impact of Health Literacy on Employee Productivity: An Empirical Investigation. *Empirical Quests for Management Essences*, 3(1), 21-33.
- Ünler, E., & Kılıç, B. (2019). Paternalistic leadership and employee organizational attitudes: the role of positive/negative affectivity. *Sage Open*, 9(3), 2158244019862665.
- Veliu, L., Manxhari, M., Demiri, V., & Jahaj, L. (2017). THE INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON EMPLOYEE'S PERFORMANCE. *Management (16487974)*, 31(2).
- Vogelgesang, G. R., Leroy, H., & Avolio, B. J. (2013). The mediating effects of leader integrity with transparency in communication and work engagement/performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(3), 405-413.
- Waldan, R. (2020). The effect of Leader Support and Competence to the Organizational Commitment on Employees Performance of Human Resources Development Agency in West Kalimantan. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan (JEBIK)*, 9(1), 31-49.
- Yaslioglu, M. M., & Erden, N. S. (2018). Transformational leaders in action: Theory has been there, but what about practice?. *IUP Journal of Business Strategy*, 15(1), 42-53.
- Zhang, Z., Jia, M., & Gu, L. (2014). Transformational leadership in crisis situations: evidence from the People's Republic of China. In *Whither Chinese HRM?* (pp. 143-167). Routledge.
- Zhu, C. J., & Warner, M. (2019). The emergence of human resource management in China: Convergence, divergence and contextualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(1), 87-97.
- Zill, A., Knoll, M., Cook, A., & Meyer, B. (2020). When do followers compensate for leader silence? The motivating role of leader injustice. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(1), 65-79.