

## Do Leadership Styles impact on Organizational Commitment of Workers? Evidence from Champion Breweries PLC, Nigeria

BLESSING STEPHEN ESSIEN, EDIDIIONG ANTHONY EKORIKO  
University of Uyo, Nigeria

**Abstract:** The question whether leadership styles impact on organizational commitment of workers is a rhetorical one that common sense answer does not suffice. It requires scientific inquiry. This study therefore undertook an exploratory investigation of the impact of autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers' punctuality, innovativeness and creativity, tasks performance, job retention and participation in decision making process among employees of Champion Breweries Plc Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. A total of 180 workers including managers were studied. Questionnaires were used for data collection and the data were analyzed using simple percentages and regression analysis. Findings revealed that leadership styles influenced workers commitment. Workers were punctual to duties when democratic and autocratic leadership styles were used as against laissez-faire. Equally, democratic style of leadership had significant influence on workers innovativeness, tasks performance, job retention and participation in decision making. On the contrary autocratic and laissez-faire styles had significant negative influences on workers job retention and participation in decision making. The study recommended the use of contingency approach in the management of behaviour. Particularly, democratic leadership style should be combined with other two styles where necessary, since it had more positive influence on organizational commitment.

**Keywords:** Leadership-styles, Organization, Commitment, Workers, Champion Breweries and Nigeria.

### 1. Introduction

The efficiency in resource mobilization, utilization, and coordination depend largely on managers and their style of leadership. According to Jeremy (2012), leadership is the process of influencing others'

commitment towards realizing their full potentials in achieving specific goals. The nature of this influence is such that the members of the work-group cooperate voluntarily with each other in order to achieve set objectives. The appropriate leadership style to be adopted by managers to extract workers commitments towards organizational efficiency still remain a management issue (Jeremy, 2012; Marturano and Gosling, 2007). Managing people and resources in organizations is one of the key factors in measuring organizational health (Obiwuru, Okwu, Akpa and Nwankere 2011).

According to Michael (2010) leadership style has direct impact on the successes or otherwise in the organization. For instance, leadership styles determine workers adherence to organizational values, culture, change, motivation as well as shape institutional strategies including their execution and effectiveness. Hackett (1979) identified three types of leadership styles as Autocratic, Democratic and Laissez-faire. According to him, the autocratic leadership style is one whom managers closely supervise the subordinates by issuing precise and detailed instructions to cover every task undertaken. He sees democratic leadership style as that which the managers communicates and consults with subordinates or groups more often, with group members taking active in part in the decision making process of the organization. While the laissez faire leadership style, for Hackett (1979) is the type that promotes subordinates to take decisions they deem necessary to complete their work. Other variant include: Authoritative, Participatory, Consultative, Persuasive, Paternalistic, Exploitative and Management by Walking Around (MBWA). This study aligns with Hackett classification system.

Earlier study of brewing industries in Lagos by Dehinsilu (1999) revealed that democratic leadership seemed to have had impact on workers satisfaction.

Udoh (2009) in his study of leadership styles in Nigerian industries also noted that democratic leadership style adopted in firms promoted workers motivation and productivity. Given these findings, it is pertinent to ask; what reasons could account for high employee turnover in Champion Breweries Plc in recent times? How about the bickering by the workers about the management of the company? These and other issues necessitated this study. There is also dearth of literature linking management styles and workers commitment in the company. This therefore calls for an evaluation of the style of leadership currently in use in the firm as leadership styles tend to be dynamic.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study was to:

- To examine whether democratic, laissez faire and autocratic leadership styles influences workers` punctuality in Champion Breweries Nigeria Plc.
- To examine whether democratic, laissez faire, autocratic leadership styles influence Job retention of workers in Champion Breweries Plc.
- To find out which among democratic, laissez faire, autocratic leadership styles influence tasks performance among workers in Champion Breweries Plc.
- To investigate the influence of democratic, laissez faire and autocratic leadership styles on workers innovativeness in Champion Breweries Plc.
- To find out if democratic, laissez faire, autocratic leadership styles influence participation in decision making among workers in Champion Breweries Plc.

## 3. Research Hypotheses

The study investigated the following hypotheses:

Ho1: There is no significant influence of democratic, laissez-faire, autocratic leadership styles and workers punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc.

Ho2: There is no significant influence of democratic, laissez faire, autocratic leadership styles and job retention in Champion Breweries Plc.

Ho3: There is no significant influence of democratic, laissez-faire, autocratic leadership styles and task performance among workers in Champion Breweries Plc.

Ho4: There is no significant relationship between democratic, laissez-faire, Autocratic leadership styles

and workers innovativeness in Champion Breweries Plc.

Ho5: There is no significant relationship between democratic, laissez-faire, autocratic leadership styles and Participation in decision making among workers in Champion Breweries Plc.

## 4. Review of Related Literature.

### 4.1 The Concept of Leadership

Leadership may be described simply as the process of influencing behaviour towards the achievement of some particular goals. Koontz (1996:123) sees it as “the art of influencing people so that they will strive willingly towards the achievement of group goals”. Underlie the concept is the ability to extract obedience and to translate the obedience into something meaningful or valuable. Therefore, the core task of management is to get work done given available resources be it material or human or a combination of both. Hence, productivity in organizations is tied to leadership capabilities. Leadership and management are sometimes used interchangeably.

### 4.2 Leadership Styles

Leadership style is viewed by Jeremy (2012) as the combination of traits, characteristics, skills and behaviours that managers use when interacting with subordinates. Fiedler (1969) see leadership style as a pattern of managerial behaviour designed to integrate personal or organizational interest and effect, in the pursuit of some objectives. In modern organizational theories, three classical leadership styles have been identified; they are (i) autocratic style (ii) democratic style and (iii) laissez-faire style (Yuki, 1994; Bass and Avolio 1994, Sashin, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1987). Each of the leadership style is discussed in detail below:

#### (a) Autocratic leadership style

Autocratic leadership style, according to Gordon (2013) is often termed to as “do as I say” types. They noted that authoritative managers retain for themselves the decision-making rights and shared no vision with workers and little motivation them beyond coercion. Commitment, creativity and innovation are typically eliminated by autocratic managers. This style of leadership as suggested by Gordon (2013) is based on the traditional premise that managers are good leaders who direct and control their people. Michael (2010) observes that those followers (employees) are obedient subordinates who follow orders. This position is supported by Gordon (2013) that employees under

autocratic leadership style are expected to follow the orders of their manager even if they do not agree or do not receive any explanation.

Gordon (2013) stated that organizations with an autocratic style of leadership have instances of employee absenteeism and unusually high turnover. Gordon (2013) maintained that employees' problems with autocratic leadership include the idea that managers do not trust their employees, the fact that managers often use punishment or threat to motivate employees, and the fact that employees' input is generally not valued. She further stressed that autocratic leadership often has a negative effect on employees' morale. She went further to state that when talented employees are confronted with an autocratic manager, they become more passive, aggressive, and often tend to leave the organization and, in some cases, the employees may also feel resentful and look for ways to get their managers in trouble, a situation which may lead to paranoia on the part of the manager.

Despite this identified drawbacks of autocratic leadership style, Swarup (2013) argued that autocratic leadership is not all bad. He posits that sometimes it is the most effective style to apply in situations when: new and untrained employees who may not be acquainted with the tasks to perform or are confronted with problem of which procedure to follow, effective supervision can be provided only through detailed orders and instructions, in circumstances where employees are averse to any other leadership style, there are high-volume production needs on daily basis, there is time constraint to make a decision, a managers' power is challenged by an employee, the workplace is ineffectively managed, and when work needs to be coordinated with another department or organization. He however, suggested that autocratic leadership style should not be used when: employees become tensed, fearful and resentful, employees expect to have their opinions heard, employees begin depending on their managers to make all their decisions, and there is low employee morale, high turnover and absenteeism and work stoppage.

#### **(b) Democratic Management Style**

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) describe democratic leadership as one where decision-making is decentralized and shared by subordinates. The democratic leadership style is also referred to as the participative management style. The potential for poor decision-making and weak execution is, however the major motivation of this style. The focus of this style is on performance and people (Puni,

Offei and Okoe 2014). Daft (1999) describes the democratic manager as one who delegates authority to subordinates or employees, encourages contributions from employees and depends on the knowledge of the subordinates to complete tasks as well as on their respect for influence. It is a leadership style that encourages employees to participate in decision-making process in the organization. In the views of Iheriohanma, Wokoma, and Nwokorie (2014), democratic leadership style tends to foster responsibility, flexibility, and high morale that will result to improved employees' performance. They further argued that since employees are engaged in decision-making, delegation and planning in the organization, there is a tendency for them to be more realistic about organizational needs. This suggests that in democratic leadership, the employees feel comfortable with the trust reposed in them which gives them the confidence to build a strong cooperation, team spirit, high morale and jettison any element that will work at cross propose with the organization.

Despite the benefits associated with democratic leadership style, it has some pitfalls. According to Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) the biggest problem with democratic leadership is its underlying assumption that everyone has an equal stake in an outcome as well as shared levels of expertise with regard to decisions. Iheriohanma et al (2014) on the other hand suggest that there is potential for poor decisions to be made by the subordinates as a result of the manager depending on the contributions made by the employees or subordinates. They also stressed that the democratic leadership is marked by several drawbacks that must be overcome to ensure its effectiveness in the organization. He pointed out five basic challenges of the democratic leadership style to include: competency, crises, consensus, pseudo-participation, and adherence. He further concluded that overcoming these five negatives of the democratic leadership style will allow organizations to fully benefit from the advantages of this management style such as higher employee performance, satisfaction and better retention rates. This is because a working environment with democratic leadership style creates opportunities for employees' empowerment, creativity, initiative, participation, career growth and development (Iheriohanma et al, 2014).

#### **(c) Laissez-faire Leadership Style**

Laissez-faire leadership style is the opposite of autocratic style. In Laissez-faire leadership style,

responsibility of decision making process is passed to the group; as the manager has no confidence in his leadership ability. Decision making under a manager that adopt this style is performed by whoever that is willing to accept it. Decision making is also very slow and there can be a great deal of “buck passing”. Bass and Aviola (1994) describe the laissez faire leadership style as one in which the leader has no faith in their ability to supervise. He further stated that the manager has no clear set goals towards how they may work, do not help the group in making decisions and so leave too much responsibility with their subordinates. It is the leadership style that the manager provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible (Swarup, 2013).

In this style of leadership, all authority or power is given to the employees and they must determine goals, make decisions, and resolve problems on their own (Swarup, 2013). Ronald (2011) described the laissez-faire manager as one who believes in freedom of choice for the employees, leaving them alone so that they can do what they desired. He argued that the basis for this leadership style is in two folds: the first is that there is a strong belief that employees know their jobs best, so leave them alone to do their jobs. The second is that, the manager may be in a political (election-based) position and may not want to exert power and control for fear of not being re-elected. He stressed that a laissez-faire manager provides basic but minimal information and resources. He emphasized that in this management style, there is virtually no participation, involvement, or communication within the workforce. He further explained that the understanding of the job requirements, policies, and procedures are generally exchanged from employee to employee in laissez-faire leadership work environment.

#### **4.3 Leadership Styles and Workers Job Retention**

Michael (2008) is of the opinion that one of the critical roles of management is to create a work environment that will endear the organization to the employees. It also includes influencing employees’ decision to be committed and remain with the organization even when other job opportunities exist outside the organization. Beardwell and Claydon (2007) observe that the role of leadership is crucial in workers’ retention, and argues that employees leave managers not companies. According to Beardwell and Clayton (2007), responsibility and accountability for retaining workers need to move out to the front lines and into the hands of managers. Managers and their skills in building a climate of retention, a culture that speaks to employees in a way that encourages them to stay, will be an organization’s best defense

against unwanted turnover. Managers are therefore the secret weapon in keeping valued workers longer. Netswera, Rankhumise, and Mavundila (2005) affirmed that incompetent management results in poor employee performance, high stress, low job commitment, low job satisfaction and turnover intent. Research conducted on the state of South African Training Industry indicated that democratic leadership style was the most prominent job retention factor in South Africa (Netswera, et al 2005). Netswera et al (2005) found that majority of the employees in the organization surveyed planned to remain with the organization at least for the next five years because of the prevailing culture of management care associated with the democratic leadership style in use.

In study that examined leadership styles and organizational commitment in the Mining Industry in South Africa, Walumbwa (2011) found that employees at a mine in Mpumalanga perceived the leadership styles in use (democratic) to be capable of making workers committed, to retaining their jobs, than autocratic and laissez-faire. Such findings, although conducted in different contexts, relate closely to the results found by Walumbwa (2011). Moreover, Netswera et al (2005) examined the link between leadership styles, and workers job retention in University Libraries in Nigeria. The findings showed that the leadership style, particularly autocratic and laissez-faire, did have influence on the commitment of employees in university libraries in retaining their jobs. The majority of library professionals tended to be extremely committed to their institutions because they appreciated a result-oriented culture. Skudiene (2008) examined the influence of leadership styles on employees job retention in a manufacturing industry in Malaysia, The study found a laissez-faire leadership style as negatively associated with employees’ job retention rate. The study found that a democratic leadership style have a positive connection with workers job retention as against laissez-faire and autocratic styles.

#### **4.4 Leadership Styles and Workers Punctuality**

Leadership style and punctuality are two factors that have been regarded as fundamental for organizational success. Employees with high rate of punctuality are likely to exert more efforts in their assigned tasks and pursue organizational interests. Therefore, leadership styles of an organization can influence the punctuality of the workers (Voon 2011). Akram (2012) conducted a research entitled: How leadership styles affect workers punctuality in Pakistan. The findings revealed that democratic leadership have high positive impact on workers punctuality as against laissez-faire and autocratic.

#### 4.5 Leadership Styles and Workers Innovativeness

Jung, Chow and Wu (2003) has examined the link between management and innovation at organizational level. He found that innovation is the characteristics of leadership styles. In Bass and Avolio (1994), democratic leadership style is found to be more effective than other leadership styles in promoting innovation, insight, and craze for high achievements among the employees. Judge and Piccolo (2004) in their study found a positive relationship between democratic leadership and work effectiveness and found innovativeness to be an important component of effectiveness. The numbers of creative ideas generated have also been considered as a component of leadership effectiveness (Kahai, Sosik and Avolio, 2003). Democratic leadership style has also been found to lead to innovative work behaviour in school, colleges, and universities (Bass and Avolio (1994). Judge and Piccolo (2004) for example, interviewed human resource managers, scientists, and technicians from new biotechnology firms and concluded that giving employees operational autonomy encouraged an innovative culture. In a study among the employees of a manufacturing plant, Axtell (2000) found a positive relationship between participation and employees' innovative behaviour.

#### 4.6 Leadership Styles and Workers Task Performance

Empirical evidence has demonstrated that management behaviours influence employees' task performance (Burns 1978). In the Canadian financial industry, it was found that democratic leadership style is more strongly correlated with higher employee task performance than autocratic and laissez-faire styles (Meyer and Botha, 2000). Literature reveals that under democratic leadership style, employees receive individualized attention from the manager. As a result, they tend to reciprocate by supporting the managers' agenda by performing beyond expectations. Hence, democratic leadership style develops high quality leader-member exchange relationships with followers (Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang and Chen, 2005).

Rassol (2015) studied leadership styles and its impact on employee's performance in health sector of Pakistan and concluded that democratic leadership styles have more positive effect on workers performance than autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles. Results of the study also revealed that the impact of democratic leadership styles was not much stronger as compared to laissez-faire and

autocratic leadership styles on job task performance. The study added some additional knowledge for a better understanding of the preferred management approach and appropriate style for using with subordinate in various professional levels. By using the results, leaders can adjust their behaviours in practical ways to enhance subordinates' job performance, thereby reaping increased productivity for their organizations as a consequence. They emphasized the need for managers to have the ability to influence their subordinates, and to set clear standards of performance to their peers. Ojokuku, Odetayo, and Sajuyigbe (2012) conducted a research on the Impact of leadership styles on employees task Performance: A Case Study of First Bank in Nigeria, findings showed that there was positive and negative correlation between performance and leadership style. There was 23 percent variance of performance found in leadership style jointly predict organizational performance. This study concluded that democratic leadership styles have positive effect on both workers task performance and followership. Leng (2014) found that there was a significant impact of leadership styles towards employee's participation in decision making. It was discovered that democratic leadership styles offers this participation as against laissez-faire and autocratic styles, hence there is greater organizational commitment among workers. Sakiru, Enoho, Kareem and Abdullahi (2013) study found that there is a substantial relationship between worker participation in decision making with emotional intelligent and leadership styles.

### 5. Methodology

#### 5.1 Research Design

This study adopted the descriptive survey research design. Data were obtained from the respondents without imposing on them any values.

#### 5.2 Population/ Sample of the Study

The population of the study comprised 180 (one hundred and eighty) workers in Champion Breweries Nigeria Limited who were directly on the payroll of the company excluding Outsourced staffers. Of the 180 population, 13 were managerial staff, while 167 were lower level workers (Office of the Human Resource Manager, Champion Breweries Nigeria Limited, 2018). In view of the small number of workers in the company the study purposively adopted the 180 employees as its sample size as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Department and Number of Staff in Champion Breweries PLC**

S/N	DEPARTMENT	NUMBER OF STAFF
1	Account	9
2	Administration	19
3	Brewing	32
4	Engineering	17
5	Human Resource	9
6	Packaging	21
7	Quality Control	12
8	Warehouse	35
9	Sales	26
10	Security	11
	TOTAL	180

Source: Office of the Human Resource Manager Champion Breweries Plc, 2019.

### 5.4 Methods of Data Collection

Questionnaire was used to obtain data for the study. Two instruments were prepared, one was for the workers to rate the leadership styles of managers in the company, the other was for the managers to rate the organizational commitment of the workers. The data obtained were subjected to a reliability test using Cronbach Alpha Statistical tool and the result yielded reliability coefficients of 0.82 for leadership style questionnaire and 0.78 for organizational commitment questionnaire which are high enough to justify the reliability of the instrument.

### 5.6 Method of Data Analysis

Simple percentages were used to analyze the bio-data of the respondents, while multiple regressions were used to test the five hypotheses. To enhance data analysis and computation of results, the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 22.0) was used.

## 6. Data Analysis

**Table 2: Demographics of the Respondents**

Variables	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
<b>Sex:</b>		
Male	114	63.3
Female	66	36.7
Total	180	100.0
<b>Level of Education:</b>		
SSCE/WASSCE	123	68.3
OND/NCE	18	10.0
HND/B. Sc	39	21.7
M. Sc		
Total	180	100
<b>Years of Experience:</b>		
Less than 5 years	122	67.8
5 – 10 years	43	23.9
Above 10 years	15	8.3
Total	180	100

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Result in Table 2 revealed that 114 respondents representing 63.3 percent were male and 66 respondents representing 36.7 percent of the respondents were female. Result revealed that the larger percentages of the respondents were male. This can be attributed to the fact that factory work is best suited for men, hence the higher number of males than females in the Company. The Result on educational qualification also revealed that 68.3 percent of the respondents were holders of SSCE/Equivalent, 10.0 percent were holders of OND/NCE while the remaining 21.7 percent were holders of HND/B. Sc certificates. The result showed that the majority of the respondents were holders of SSCE/Equivalent (68.3%). Equally, 122 respondents (67.8%) had less than 5 years of work experience, 43 respondents (23.9%) had 5-10 years of work experience while 15 respondents (8.3%) had more than 10 years of work experience. From the result, more than half of the respondents (67.8%) had less than 5 years of work experience.

7. Test of Hypotheses

**H<sub>0</sub>1:** There is no significant influence of democratic, autocratic and Laissez-faire leadership styles on workers' punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc.

**Table 3:** Model summary for the influence of democratic, autocratic and Laissez-faire leadership styles and workers' punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.253 <sup>a</sup>	.064	.048	2.24425

Result in Table 3 presents the model summary for the influence of leadership styles on workers punctuality in Champion Brewery. Result reveals correlation coefficient of 0.253 and coefficient of determination of 0.064 which implies that the three leadership styles accounted for 6.4 percent of the variation in workers' punctuality in Champion Brewery. To determine the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc, Analysis of Variance was used and the results presented in Table 4.

**Table 4:** ANOVA result summary showing the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers' punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	60.539	3	20.180	4.007	.009
	Residual	886.456	176	5.037		
	Total	946.994	179			

Table 4 presents the result of ANOVA for the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc. The result reveals F-calculated of 4.007 and p-value of 0.009 with F-critical of 2.66. The F-calculated is greater than the F-critical which implies that there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers' punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc. Also, to determine the nature of the influence of each of the leadership style on workers' punctuality, the regression coefficient as well as the t-statistic with their respective p-values was computed and the result is as presented in Table 5.

**Table 5:** Regression coefficient and t-statistic results testing the influence of each of the leadership style on workers punctuality

Model	Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	6.865	1.105		6.22	.000		
Democratic leadership Style	.154	.062	.199	2.49	.014*	.835	1.197
Autocratic leadership Style	.090	.054	.128	1.67	.098	.905	1.105
Laissez Faire	-.107	.060	-.140	-1.79	.075	.874	1.144

\*significant at 5 % (p<0.05), F-critical = 2.66

Table 5 presents the result of the regression coefficient and t-statistic results testing the influence of each of the leadership style on workers punctuality. The assumption of no multi-collinearity among the predictors' variables (democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire management styles) was tested using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and VIF values of 1.197, 1.105 and 1.144 were obtained for democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles respectively. The VIF are all less than 10 meaning that there is no evidence of multi-collinearity among the explanatory variables. Result of beta coefficient reveals standardized beta coefficients of 0.199, 0.128 and -0.140 for democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles which implies that the more the superior apply democratic and autocratic leadership styles, workers' punctuality will improve. But for laissez-faire leadership style, the reverse was the case meaning that the more laissez-faire the managers are the lesser the punctuality of workers in the company.

Result also shows that among the three leadership styles, democratic management has the significant positive influence on workers' punctuality while the influence of other leadership styles were not significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). But for the fact that F-calculated (4.007) is greater than the F-critical (2.661), the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers' punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc.

**Hypothesis 2**

**Ho2:** There is no significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on job retention in Champion Breweries Plc.

**Table 6:** Multiple regression summaries showing the influence democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on job retention in Champion Breweries

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.279 <sup>a</sup>	.078	.062	1.46443

Result in Table 6 presents the model summary for the influence of leadership styles on job retention in Champion Breweries. Result reveals correlation coefficient of 0.279 and coefficient of determination of 0.062 which implies that the three management styles accounted for 6.2 percent of the variation in workers punctuality in Champion Brewery. To determine the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers' punctuality in Champion Breweries PLC, Analysis of Variance was used and the results presented in Table 7.

**Table 7:** ANOVA result summary showing the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and job retention in Champion Breweries

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	31.761	3	10.587	4.937	.003 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	377.439	176	2.145		
	Total	409.200	179			

Table 7 presents the result of ANOVA for the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and job retention in Champion Breweries Plc. The result reveals F-calculated of 4.937 and p-value of 0.003 with F-critical of 2.66. The F-calculated is greater than the F-critical which implies that there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc. In order to determine the nature of the influence of each of the leadership style on job retention, the regression coefficient, the t-statistic with their respective p-values was computed and the result is as presented in Table 8.

**Table 8:** Regression coefficient and t-statistic results testing the influence of each of the leadership style on job retention

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	9.266	.721		12.854	.000		
	Democratic leadership style	-.017	.040	-.032	-.409	.683	.835	1.197
	Autocratic Leadership style	-.078	.035	-.169	-2.216	.028*	.905	1.105
	Laissez Faire leadership style	.132	.039	.262	3.378	.001*	.874	1.144

\*significant at 5 % ( $p < 0.05$ ), F-critical = 2.66

The result of the regression coefficient and t-statistic results testing the influence of each of the leadership style on the influence of democratic, autocratic and Laissez-faire leadership styles on job retention in Champion Breweries Plc. Result of individual leadership style influence on job retention show that autocratic leadership style ( $\beta = -0.169$ , t-cal. -2.216,  $p = 0.028$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) had significant negative influence on job retention while laissez-faire leadership

style ( $\beta=0.262$ ,  $t = 3.38$ ,  $p =0.001$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) had significant positive influence on job retention. This means that where autocratic leadership style is used, the level of workers job retention is low, and when laissez-faire is applied, the level of job retention is high. For democratic leadership style, its influence was not significant ( $\beta=0.032$ ,  $t= -0.409$ ,  $p = 0.683$ ).

In summary, the F-calculated (4.937) is greater than the F-critical (2.66). This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence, there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on job retention in Champion Breweries Plc.

**Hypothesis 3**

**Ho3:** There is no significant influence of democratic, autocratic and Laissez faire, leadership styles on task performance among workers in Champion Breweries Plc.

**Table 9:** Multiple regression summary showing the influence democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on task performance in Champion Breweries

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.202 <sup>a</sup>	.041	.025	1.97656

Result reveals correlation coefficient of 0.202 and coefficient of determination of 0.025 which implies that the three leadership styles accounted for 2.5% of the variation in workers task performance in Champion Breweries. To determine the influence of democratic autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers’ task performance in Champion Breweries Plc, Analysis of Variance was used and the result presented in Table 10.

**Table 10:** ANOVA result summary showing the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and Job Retention in Champion Breweries Plc.

Model		Sum of Squares	D f	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	29.384	3	9.795	2.807	.041
	Residual	687.594	176	3.907		
	Total	716.978	179			

Results of the ANOVA for the influence of democratic autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers’ task performance in Champion Breweries Plc, reveals that F-calculated of 2.807 and P-value0.041 with F-critical of 2.66. The F-calculated is greater than the F-critical which implies that there is a significant influence of democratic autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers’ task performance among the workers. To determine the nature of the influence of each of the styles on task performance, the regression coefficient as well as the t-statistics with their respective P-value was computed and the results presented in Table 11.

**Table 11:** Regression coefficient and t-statistic results testing the influence of each of the leadership style on workers’ task performance

Model		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	9.431	.973		9.694	.000		
	Democratic Style	.014	.053	.0211	2.666	.008*	.835	1.197
	Autocratic Style	-.021	.047	-.035	-.446	.656	.905	1.105
	Laissez-faire style	.173	.055	.108	1.333	.184	.874	1.144

\*significant at 5% ( $p<0.05$ ), F-critical= 2.66

Results from the Table 11 reveal that democratic leadership style ( $\beta = 0.211$ ,  $t = 2.67$ ,  $p = 0.008$ ) has significant positive influence on task performance. This implies, that democratic leadership style brings out high task performances from workers, while autocratic ( $\beta = -0.035$ ,  $t = -0.446$ ,  $p = 0.656$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) and Laissez-faire leadership style ( $\beta = -0.108$ ,  $t = -1.33$ ,  $p = 0.184$ ,  $p>0.05$ ) both had negative influence on task performance ( $p>0.05$ ). It can therefore be said that, both autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles do not bring out high task performances from workers. The F-calculated (2.807) is greater than the F-critical (2.66) at 0.05 levels of

significance. Hence, there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-fair leadership styles on task performance among employees in Champion Breweries Plc.

**Hypothesis 4**

Ho4: There is no significant relationship between democratic, laissez faire, autocratic leadership styles and workers’ innovativeness in Champion Breweries Plc

**Table 12:** Multiple regression summary showing the influence democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers’ innovativeness in Champion Breweries

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.314 <sup>a</sup>	.098	.083	1.57596

Result in Table 12 presents the model summary for the influence of leadership styles on workers innovativeness in Champion Breweries. Result reveals correlation coefficient of 0.314 and coefficient of determination of 0.083 which implies that the three leadership styles accounted for 8.3 percent of the variation in workers’ punctuality in Champion Breweries. To determine the influence of democratic autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers innovativeness in Champion Breweries PLC, Analysis of Variance was used and the result presented in Table 13.

**Table 13:** ANOVA result summary showing the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers’ innovativeness in Champion Breweries

Model		Sum of Squares	D f	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	47.676	3	15.892	6.399	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	437.124	176	2.484		
	Total	484.800	179			

Table 13 presents the result of ANOVA for the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers innovativeness in Champion Breweries Plc. The result reveals F-calculated of 6.399 and p-value of 0.000 with F-critical of 2.66. The F-calculated is greater than the F-critical which implies that there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers innovativeness in Champion Breweries Plc. Also, to determine the nature of the influence of each of the leadership style on workers’ punctuality, the regression coefficient as well as the t-statistic with their respective p-values was computed and the result is as presented in Table 14.

**Table 14:** Regression coefficient and t-statistic results testing the influence of each of the leadership style on workers’ innovativeness

Model		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	9.800	.776		12.633	.000		
	Democratic Style	.014	.043	.025	.324	.746	.835	1.197
	Autocratic Style	-.051	.038	-.101	-1.339	.182	.905	1.105
	Laissez-faire style	.170	.042	.310	4.052	.000*	.874	1.144

\*significant at 5 % ( p<0.05), F-critical = 2.66

The influence of each of the leadership style was investigated and the result reveals that democratic leadership style ( $\beta=0.025$ ,  $t = 0.324$ ,  $p = 0.746$ ) and laissez-faire leadership style ( $\beta = 0.310$ ,  $t = 4.05$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) had positive influence on workers’ innovativeness. This result means that democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles enhance workers’ innovativeness. But for autocratic leadership style ( $\beta = -0.101$ ,  $t = -1.34$ ,  $p = 0.182$ ) its influence was negative. Therefore, autocratic leadership style does not enhances workers innovativeness. Result also reveals that among the three management styles, only laissez-faire leadership style has significant positive influence on workers’ innovativeness ( $p < 0.05$ ). This means laissez-faire leadership style, enhances workers’ innovativeness higher than democratic style, while autocratic do not, at all. The F-calculated (6.399) is greater than the F-critical (2.66) which means that there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers’ innovativeness. This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence, there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers’ innovativeness.

**Hypothesis 5**

Ho5: There is no significant relationship between democratic, autocratic and laissez faire, leadership styles and Participation in decision making among workers’ in Champion Breweries Plc.

**Table 15:** Multiple regression summary showing the influence democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers’ participation in decision in Champion Breweries Plc.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.608 <sup>a</sup>	.369	.359	1.68079

Table 15 presents the model summary for the influence of leadership styles and workers’ participation in decision making in Champion Breweries. Result reveals correlation coefficient of 0.608 and coefficient of determination of 0.359 which implies that the three leadership styles accounted for 35.9 percent of the variation in workers’ participation in decision making in Champion Breweries. To determine the influence of democratic autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on participation in decision making in Champion Breweries Plc, Analysis of Variance was used and the result presented in Table 16.

**Table 16:** ANOVA result summary showing the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers’ participation in decision making in Champion Breweries Plc.

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	291.116	3	97.039	34.349	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	497.212	176	2.825		
	Total	788.328	179			

Table 16 presents the result of ANOVA for the influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers participation in decision making in Champion Breweries Plc. The result reveals F-calculated of 34.349 and p-value of 0.000 with F-critical of 2.66. The F-calculated is greater than the F-critical which implies that there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles and workers punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc. Also, to determine the nature of the influence of each of the management style on workers’ participation in decision making, the regression coefficient as well as the t-statistic with their respective p-values was computed and the result is as presented in Table 17.

**Table 17:** Regression coefficient and t-statistic results testing the influence of each of the leadership style on workers’ participation in decision making in champion Breweries

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	5.085	.827		6.146	.000		
	Democratic leadership Style	.392	.045	.561	8.758	.000*	.835	1.197
	Autocratic leadership Style	.081	.040	.127	2.015	.045	.905	1.105
	Laissez-Faire leadership style	.015	.046	.021	.325	.000	.874	1.144

\*significant at 5 % (p<0.05), F-critical = 2.66

Result reveals that democratic leadership style ( $\beta = 0.021$ ,  $t = 0.33$ ,  $p = 0.746$ ), laissez-faire leadership style ( $\beta = 0.127$ ,  $t = 2.02$ ,  $p = 0.045$ ) had positive influence on workers’ participation in decision making while autocratic leadership had negative influence on workers’ participation in decision making ( $\beta = -0.127$ ,  $t = -2.015$ ,  $p = 0.045$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Results reveal furthermore that democratic leadership style has significant positive influence on workers’ participation in decision making while autocratic leadership style has significant negative influence ( $p < 0.05$ ). This means, democratic and laissez-faire

leadership styles allows more participation of workers’ in decision making than autocratic style. The F-calculated (34.349) is greater than the F-critical (2.66). The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant relationship between democratic, autocratic and laissez faire, leadership styles and participation in decision making among workers’ in Champion Breweries Plc.

**8. Discussion of Findings**

This section discusses the findings of the study with regards to the hypotheses of the Research.

Result from analysis of hypothesis one show that the F-calculated (4.007) is greater than the F-critical (2.66) which means that there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers' punctuality in Champion Breweries Plc therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. Results further reveal that, the more the superior applies democratic and autocratic leadership styles, workers' punctuality will improve. But for laissez-faire leadership style, the reverse was the case meaning that the more laissez-faire the managers are the lesser the punctuality of workers' in Champion Breweries Plc. The latest finding is not an isolated one. For instance, Akram (2012) on a study of how leadership styles affect workers punctuality concluded that democratic and autocratic leadership styles have high influence on workers' punctuality as against laissez faire. Also Nasir (2014) study on the relationship between leadership styles and workers punctuality, arrived at the conclusion that management styles are interrelated and influence workers punctuality.

In analysis of hypothesis two, the F-calculated (4.937) was greater than the F-critical (2.66). This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Hence, there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on job retention in Champion Breweries Plc. Also, result of individual management style influence on job retention show that autocratic leadership style had significant negative influence on job retention while laissez-faire leadership style had significant positive influence on job retention. For democratic management style, its influence was not significant. Similarly, Michael (2008), in their work on organizational commitment and leadership styles in a mining industry in South Africa agreed that autocratic management style had a negative influence on job retention and that workers preferred democratic and laissez-faire styles more.

With respect to hypothesis three, the result reveals that democratic leadership style has significant positive influence on task performance, while autocratic and laissez-faire leadership style both had negative influence on task performance. The F-calculated (2.807) is greater than the F-critical (2.66) at 0.05 levels of significance. Hence, there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-fair leadership styles on task performance among employees in Champion Breweries Plc. Nasir (2014) had asserted in his research on nurses' perception of democratic, autocratic and laissez faire leadership styles and its associated outcomes, that democratic leadership style had a positive correlation with task performance and negative correlation with

laissez faire and autocratic leadership styles. He concluded that a combination of leadership styles contributed to an increase extra effort, satisfaction and overall employee performance.

In hypothesis four, the individual influence of each of the leadership style was investigated and the result reveals that democratic management style and laissez-faire leadership style had positive influence on workers' innovativeness. This result means that democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles enhance workers' innovativeness. But for autocratic leadership style its influence was negative. The F-calculated (6.399) is greater than the F-critical (2.66) which means that there is a significant influence of democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on workers' innovativeness. This result is similar to the assertions of Judge and Piccolo (2004) study's found a positive relationship between democratic leadership style and work innovativeness.

For hypothesis five, result reveals that democratic leadership style and laissez-faire leadership styles had positive influence on workers' participation in decision making while autocratic leadership had negative influence on workers' participation in decision making. The F-calculated (34.349) is greater than the F-critical (2.66). There is therefore, a significant relationship between democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire, leadership styles and Participation in decision making among workers in Champion Breweries Plc. This finding agrees with Leng (2004) study which found significant positive impact of democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles on employees' participation in decision making as against autocratic style, whose impact was negative in a retail Industry in Malaysia.

## 9. Conclusion

This study was undertaken to find out if leadership styles impact on organizational commitment of workers in Champion Breweries PLC, Nigeria. The study found out that democratic leadership style is the common style adopted by the managers in the company, although other leadership styles have been used interchangeably. Democratic leadership style has allowed workers participation in decision making, high task performance, innovativeness and productivity in the company. The study concludes, that democratic leadership style should be maintained in the company in view of its benefits to the workers and the company.

## 10. Recommendations

In view of the findings made in this work, the following recommendations are made:

- Democratic and autocratic leadership styles have a positive influence on workers punctuality, therefore managers should improve workers punctuality by rewarding punctual workers, punish workers who are not punctual and for workers who are consistently not punctual, the managers should get to the bottom of the situation as to why such workers exhibit such attitude. If this is done it will enhance the commitment of workers.
- The study found that job retention is influenced by democratic leadership style, as such managers should create an environment that makes employees have satisfaction, recognize their contributions, treat them with fairness, that way would boost their desire to remain in the organization.
- Democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles also impact on task performance hence, managers should provide comprehensive training regularly to their managers to enable them know the weaknesses and strengths of the workers. Knowledge of the latter would enhance managers to fit the right employees at the right task. It is nice to be rewarded for a task well done; offering incentives will help improve task performance.
- Democratic leadership style promote workers innovativeness hence, managers should encourage them to offer ideas, regardless of their rank or tenure at the company. This allows for a diverse range of opinions, ideas and perspectives.
- Since democratic leadership style influences participation of workers in decision making, managers should apply this leadership style more especially in areas to which committed workers have a desirable performance.

## References

- Aboshaiqah, S. (2015). Professional Accountability for Effective Leadership on Nursing Practice. South Africa: Kwela Books Publishers
- Akram, M. (2012). How Leadership Behaviors Affect Organizational Performance in Pakistan. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 4(6), pp. 354-363.
- Argyris, C. (1955). "Some Characteristics of Successful Executives". *Personal Journal*, June, 50-63.
- Axtell, C. (2000). 'Shopfloor innovation: Facilitating the suggestion and implementation of ideas', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 73, pp. 265-285.
- Bass, B., and Avolio, B.J. (1994) Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 17, 541-554.
- Beardwell J., and Claydon, T. (2007). Human Resource Management. A Contemporary Approach. London: Prentice Hall.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Daft, R. (1999). Leadership, the Dryden Press, Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dehinsilu, Y. A. (1999). Leadership Styles and Organizational Change in Brewing Industry. M.sc. Dissertation submitted to the Department of Sociology, University of Ibadan. Ibadan.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1969) Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gordon, J.(2013). Autocratic Leadership Style. (Online: [http://www.action-wheel.com/autocraticleadership\\_style.Html](http://www.action-wheel.com/autocraticleadership_style.Html)). Retrieved June 4, 2013.
- Hackett, J. (1979). Nothing New Under the Sun: Leadership from a Historical Perspective. *Management Decision*, 41(1/2), 85-95.
- Iheriohanma, E.B.J., Wokoma, C.U., and Nwokorie, C.N. (2014). Leadership Question and the Challenges of Community Development in Nigeria, *European Scientific Journal*, 10(35): 204 – 216. [www.eujournal.org](http://www.eujournal.org).
- Jeremy, M (2012) Perceived Leadership Style and Employee Participation in a Manufacturing Company in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(15), 5389-5398.
- Judge, T.A.and Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta analytic Test of their Relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (5) 755-768. (2015), "The Essence of Leadership" Notions Press in India.
- Jung, D.I., Chow, C.,and Wu, A. (2003). The Role of Transformational Leadership in enhancing Organizational Innovation: Hypotheses and Some Preliminary Findings. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 525.
- Kahai, S. S., Sosik, J. J., and Avolio, B. J. (2003). Effects of Leadership Style, Anonymity, and

- Rewards on Creativity-relevant Processes and outcomes in an electronic meeting system context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 499.
- Kootz, H. (1996) *Principles of Management*. McGraw Hill, Tokyo.
- Marturano, A. and Gosling, J. (2007). *Leadership: The Key Concepts*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Meyer, M. and Botha, E. (2000). *Organization Development and Transformation in South Africa*. Durban: Butterworth Press.
- Michael, A. (2010). Leadership style and organizational impact. *Management Journal*, 18(7):509-533. (Retrieved from: <http://www.ala-apa.org>)
- Michael, S. (2008). Using Motivational Strategy as Panacea for Employee Retention and Turnover in Selected Public and Private Sector Organizations in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. Master of Commerce Thesis, University of Fort Har.
- Nasir, H. 2014. The Relationship of Leadership Styles and organizational performance among IPTA Academic Leaders in Klang Valley Area, Malaysia. *Business & Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(2), 45-65.
- Netswera, F., Rankhumise, E., and Mavundila, T. R. (2005). Employee Retention Factors for South African Higher Education Institutions: A Case Study. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3 (2):36-40.
- Obiwuru, T., Okwu, A., Akpa, V.O. and Nwankwere, I. (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 and Management Research*, 1 (7), 100-111.
- Ojokuku, R., Odetayo, T. and 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.
- Puni, A., Ofei, S., and Okoe, A., (2014) The Effect of Leadership Styles on Firm Performance in Ghana. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 6(1), Canadian Center of Science and Education.
- Rassol, T. (2015) *Business Practices Management*. Swaziland: Inter Varsity Press.
- Ronald, G. (2011). *Laissez-Faire Leadership*: Encyclopedia of Leadership. California: Sage Publication.
- Sakiru, O., Enoho, D., Kareem, S. and Abdullahi, M., (2013). Relationship between Employee Performance, Leadership Styles and Emotional Intelligence in an Organization. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IOSR-JHSS)*, 8(2), pp. 53-57.
- Sashin, B. (1996). Distributed Leadership in Teams: *Management Journal*, 18(7):509-533.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1987). Transformational Leadership, Initiating Structure and Substitutes for Leadership: A Longitudinal Study of Research & Development Project Team Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 202-210.
- Skudiene, V. (2008). Impact of Leadership Styles on Employees Organizational Commitment in Luthanian Manufacturing Companies. *SEE Journal*, 57-65.
- Sosik, J., Kahai S., Avolio B. (1998). Transformational Leadership and Dimensions of Creativity: Motivating Idea Generation in Computer-Mediated Groups. *Creativity Res. J.* 11(2): 111-121.
- Swarup, B. (2013). Leadership. (On-line: <http://www.hrfolks.com>). Retrieved April 14, 2015.
- Tannebaum, R and Schmidt, W. H. (1958). How to Choose a Leadership Pattern (pp. 3-12) Institute of Industrial Relation.
- Udoh, R. (2009). *Leadership Styles in Nigerian Industries*. Calabar: Merb Publishers.
- Voon, M. (2011). The Influence of Leadership Styles on Employees' Job Satisfaction in Public Sector Organizations in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Science*, 2(1), 24-32.
- Walumbwa, F. (2011). *Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of Leader member exchange, self-efficacy, and organizational identification* Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 115(2), 204-213.
- Wang, H., Law, K.S., Hackett, R., Wang, D., and Chen, Z. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48 (3), 420.
- Yuki, G. A. (1994) *Leadership in Organization*. Englewood cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.