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Abstract
This study aims at showing the empirical effects of leadership styles on leadership effectiveness in Universities located in Nasarawa State, Nigeria. Responses from senior staff on leadership styles and leadership effectiveness constructs were regressed by Ordinary Least Square method with the help of E-Views Version 15. Validation of the instrument via Peer-review and Split-Half reliability test result of 87% coupled with a scientific determination of the sample size, all assure the robustness of our findings at p value of 0.05. For NSUK a unit increases each in transactional and transformational styles increases leadership effectiveness by 81% and 9% respectively. For BHU, a unit increase in transformational style increases effectiveness by 47% while a unit decrease in transaction style decreases effectiveness by about 19%. For FED, a unit increases each in transactional and transformational styles increases effectiveness by 100% and 9.5% respectively. Amongst our recommendations are that University leaders should rely more on transactional leadership style for public Universities and Transformational leadership for private Universities, Executive support is sine qua non for effective transformational leadership and the Federal Government of Nigeria needs to amend the Act establishing TETFUND to accommodate private Universities to improve their ability to adopt transactional leadership style.
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Introduction
Leadership is an important ligament in the functioning of virtually all human organizations. Wherever people come together to carry out an activity with the aim of achieving certain objectives, whether formalized or just with an understanding, leadership and the manner in which it is applied become important. Organisations’ fortunes have often been altered just by changing their leadership compositions and this principle cuts across governments, companies, institutions whether local or international, religious organizations,
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societies, and non-governmental organizations. This makes the subject of leadership not only interesting but pervasive. Little wonder leadership has had as many definitions as the persons that have attempted to look at it (Stogdill in Stoner, Freeman, and Gilbert, 1995). The failure of most organizations, including governments has been blamed on the leadership, rightly because the head where the engine of vision, mission, strategy and decision-making lies, should drive the body and not the other way round. Leadership has also been considered crucial to strategy implementation (Thompson and Strickland, 2004).

Of equal importance as the subject of leadership is the manner or pattern (styles) of application in the work place. The styles of leadership have also attracted the attention of both scholars and practitioners in management. This is so, probably because the manner in which a phenomenon is applied has great effect on its ability to achieve intended purpose. Researchers have, therefore, argued over the years, that the style of leadership has great effects on the performance of organizations (Ogundele and Akewusola, 2006; Arif and King, 2013; and Olafemi and Ayodele, 2015). In spite of the plausibility of this argument, there has been no consensus on the style of leadership that gives the best results for all organizations and for all circumstances. This led some researchers (Situational/Contingency theorists) to conclude that any of the styles could be best depending on the situation. This means that a leader can (as often happens in practice) adopt multiple leadership styles in one organization as the situation dictates. This multiplicity of styles, coupled with the fact that, in most settings involving human beings, there are several variables that could impinge on effectiveness, compounds the problem of assigning effectiveness to any one leadership style. An attempt is made to overcome this assignment challenge by measuring the acceptability of each of the leadership styles being applied by the leader, among other variables of effectiveness. This, it is believed, shows the level of effectiveness because leadership is about maintaining effective relationship so as to achieve the needs of both the tasks and the individual (Armstrong, 2006). Acceptability is most likely a valid measure also because leadership is about enhancing willing compliance and not manipulation (Munroe, 2005).

Leadership and the manner in which it is applied (leadership styles) have significant impact on the wellbeing and eventual success of organizations. Servant leadership impacts positively on employees behavior as good citizens of their organizations (Nobari, Mohamadkhani and Davoudi, 2014) as well as their commitment procured through the trust they have on their leaders (Goh and Low, 2014) which also leads to their satisfaction (McCann, Graves and Cox, 2014) Transformational and Transactional leadership enhance organizational success through improved motivation (Sabutteh, Nkuah and
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Awal, 2014; Ochugudu and Aondoaseer, 2013) and financial progress (Mishra, Grunewald and Kulkarni, 2014). Any leadership style employed, that is also full of corruption and self-seeking, decimates the leaders’ credibility and integrity and has diminished effectiveness (Okoye and Chinasa, 2014; Enonuya, 2011; Alshammari, Almutairi and Thuwaini, 2015; and Olugbamiye, 2009).

Most of the works on leadership were found in organizations whose output could easily be measured through profit or turnover (Dia, 2014; Goh and low, 2013; Gaan N and Gaan P, 2014; and Mishra, Grunewald and Kulkarni, 2014). Some also concentrated on the leadership styles of certain individual Chief Executives (Ochugudu and Aondoaseer, 2013; and Arif and Brian, 2013). Of the service organizations, one was found to be on tertiary institutions (Sabuttey, Nkuah and Awal, 2013; and Hamid and D’Silva, 2014) while the other was on a hospital (McCann, Graves and Cox, 2014). Others have studied leadership effectiveness in an entire community- Ibo land in South Eastern Nigeria (Okoye and Chinasa, 2014). This research is not only institutional but considers a group of institutions (Universities) with three types of ownership, with no profit or sales to measure but service (education) to render.

Beginning on a blank sheet, the research shows what leadership styles are adopted by the universities in Nasarawa, and any significant differences in the styles being adopted between Universities. The relative effectiveness of the styles as measured by each leadership group is also shown. These are some of the issues that this research hypothesized and researched. The research questions are: 1. what are the leadership styles employed in the three Universities? What is the relative effectiveness of the leadership styles employed? Two hypotheses are raised to address the questions and achieve the objectives of the study thus: 1. The Universities adopt both transformational and transactional leadership; and 2. There is a significant relationship between the adoption of transformational leadership style and leadership effectiveness in the Universities; 3. There is a significant relationship between the application of transactional leadership and leadership effectiveness in the Universities. 4. There are differences in the Leadership styles employed by the Universities. The 4 Universities are the Federal University Lafia, Nasarawa state University Keffi and Bingham University Kari.

Literature Review
This section begins with a review of the theories relevant to the study. These theories include leadership and leadership effectiveness. This is followed by conceptualization of these theories from where we operationalise our
variables to be measured, the three Universities studied and the personalities at the hem of their affairs. This section is concluded by an empirical review where the methodologies and findings of previous researches in the same field as this study are reviewed. The aim of this is to situate our research and bring out its imperativeness. Included in this last section is a description of the institutions from where our respondents are drawn.

**Theoretical Framing**

**Leadership**

Leadership has not only been pervasive (Burns, 1978), it has also been elusive (Munroe, 2005). With almost as many definitions as the people who have studied it (Stogdill in Gilbert, Freeman and Stoner, 1995), leadership has been variously defined as the ability of a superior to influence the behavior of subordinates and persuade them to follow a particular line of action (Barnard, 1938), “the ability to influence others willingly to behave differently” (Armstrong, 2006), “Providing direction, motivating people and achieving objectives” (Ochugudu and Aondoaseer, 2013: 36), pushing workers to use their skills and abilities to implement activities in order to achieve organizational goals using effective leadership that makes them willing (Bass, 1985), and “the capacity to influence others through inspiration motivated by a passion, generated by a vision, produced by a conviction, ignited by a purpose” (Munroe, 2005). The more comprehensive the definition, the longer it is which length negates the beauty of conciseness expected of a good definition. Due to the comprehensiveness, Munroe’s (2005) definition shall be adopted for this study as it does not only have most of the ingredients of leadership, but touches on some of the criteria that any leadership needs to possess to be effective.

Leadership and Management are not necessarily synonymous though successful Managers employ leadership skills and styles. Management is about getting things done while leadership is about getting things done beyond normal expectation and to the satisfaction of all stakeholders. Management relies on legitimate authority while leadership relies on influence. Managers become preoccupied with achieving efficiency or doing things right by being proficient in following routines while leaders concentrate on vision, judgment and effectiveness (McCann, Graves and Cox, 2014). Most modern organizations have shown a tendency of being ‘over managed’ and ‘under led’ resulting in the failure of some of them (Bennis and Nanus, 1985).

**Leadership Styles**

Leaders have two major roles which they perform expected to satisfy three needs. The two primary roles are the achievement of assignment and the
maintenance of effective relationships with individuals and groups (Armstrong, 2006). The three main needs that leaders aim to achieve are the task needs, the group maintenance, and individual needs. The leader is to ensure that the task is carried out by gaining the confidence individuals and groups while eliminating frustration in the process of carrying out the assignment. The group needs to be maintained so that its objectives are achieved. To achieve individual needs, there is need of aligning the organizations needs and those of the individuals within the organization (Armstrong, 2006).

In pursuing leadership goals leaders adopt a variety of styles occasioned by differing leadership contexts. Some of these contexts include culture and organization goals (Lewin, 2015; Goh and Low, 2014; and Mittal, 2015), societal setting (Adalla, 2015; and Mittal, 2015), Corporate governance and organizational politics (Omoijide, 2015), and leaders’ skills and followers’ capacities (Blake and Mouton, 1986; Fieldler, 1965; Likert, 1961; and University Alliance, 2015). Leadership styles refer to the characteristic behaviour of leaders in the process of ‘directing, motivating, guiding and managing groups’ (Lewin, 2015). The styles of leadership adopted impinge on the prosperity of countries, companies, institutions and groups (Arif and King, 2013; Olafemi and Ayodele, 2015; Nobari, Mohamadkhani, and Davoudi, 2014; and Sabuttey, Nkuah, and Awal, 2013).

Leadership styles draw from leadership theories and vice versa. Analyses of leadership styles give rise to theories about leadership and also the understanding gained from leadership theories enable leaders to adopt some styles. The Business Dictionary defines management theory as “a collection of ideas which set forth general rules on how to manage a business or organization”. It explains how managers and supervisors relate in organizations to achieve goals effectively and through employees. Leadership theory thus enables us to “better explain, predict and control phenomena (leadership) occurring within a complex enterprise, and guide managerial actions in reliable directions” (McFarland, 1974: p13)

Leadership styles and leadership theories, therefore, sometimes go hand in hand. Leadership styles/theories include the Great Man theory, Trait theory, Charismatic style, Participatory theory, Democratic style, Autocratic style, Situational theory, Contingency theory, Transactional theory/style, Transformational theory/style, Servant Leadership style, Avoidance/Passive style, Laissez faire style (Johnson, 2015; Armstrong, 2006; Munroe, 2005; Arif and King, 2013; Goh and Low, 2014; Yukl, 1998; and Bass, 1990). For the purpose of this study, Transactional, Transformational, Servant, and
Autocratic leadership styles are reviewed. These are among the current leadership styles in use.

**Transformational Leadership**

This style of leadership thrives on high level of communication of the vision and goals of the organization coupled with increased motivation and involvement of employees to achieve the goals of the organization. There is also greater delegation as the leader concentrates on issues of more importance (Johnson, 2015; Armstrong, 2006; Arif & King, 2013; and Bass, 1990). This style of leadership has been considered new and popular (Arif & King, 2013), suitable for driving change in an organization (Diab, 2014). Key elements of transformational leadership include charisma or influence, inspiration, intellectual vibrancy, and individualized consideration (Diab, 2014; and Arif & King, 2013). Charisma brings about admiration and respect for the leader on account of his personality which leads to great influence on team members. Individualized consideration means that the leaders not only accept, but values individual differences and harnesses them properly for innovative problem analysis and solution. Intellectual vibrancy involves mind stimulation by the leader through creating an environment where, with team members, the leader explores various ways of looking at problems and proffering different solutions to them. Unlike the transactional leader who tries to negotiate, the transformational leader inspires team members through vision articulation and trust building to release their best efforts towards achievement of organizational goals (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Ochugudu & Aondoasseer, 2013; Goh & Low, 2014; and Yukl, 2006).

**Transactional Leadership**

Transactional leaders employ negotiation tactics with their team members where the goals are set jointly and members are encouraged to achieve them using reward and punishment. Employees agree to achieve results but also expect the leader to fulfill his own side of the bargain (Lewin, 2015; and Armstrong, 2006). Incentives and training are provided for the employees to perform while the leader monitors the outcomes of the performance (Arif & King, 2013). According to Avolio and Bass (2004), there are three basic elements of transactional leadership which are contingent reward, Management by exception - active and Management by exception – passive. Contingent reward involves meting out to employees, benefits for goal attainment and also withdrawal of benefits or even punishment for non-performance or deviant behaviour. Management by exception has to do with the leader monitoring performance and results. It is active when monitoring of selected important assignments is done throughout the process of performance with the leader taking corrective actions in situation of deviation from required standards. In passive management by exception, the leader only
intervenes when there are observed deviations from standard performance (Bass, 1990; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Ochugudu & Aondoaseer, 2013; and Aris & King, 2013).

Transactional and Transformational leadership are different in concept and practice but they augment each other (Odumera & Ogbonna, 2013). This means that hardly is one employed without the other though with varying dominance. Cates, Cojanu and Pettine (2013), in a study of U.S employees showed that there are differences in the preference of leadership styles amongst four generations. The four generations are Traditionalists (age 66 and above), Baby Boomers (ages 47-65), Generation X (ages 32-46) and Generation Y (ages 18-31). Traditionalists and Baby Boomers preferred Autocratic style; Generation X employees are more comfortable with Participative style while those of Generation Y love the free reign style (Laissez faire and Transformational styles)

**Autocratic Leadership**
Autocratic leaders exercise total authority, virtually imposing their will on their followers, taking decisions with little or no inputs from group members. Employees desiring close supervision thrive under this style of leadership while those who like some form of initiation or participation tend to suffocate (Johnson, 2015 and Lewis, 2015). Fear, threats, status and power are used to obtain compliance from subordinates with little consideration for their feelings or opinions (McFarland, 1974)

**Servant Leadership**
Servant leadership stems from the desire to help others. It has also been shown that some of the great leaders who sacrificed for their followers and achieved results have been servant leaders. It is on this premise that Munroe (2006) true leadership is a product of inspiration instead of manipulation. In fact he believes that leadership is not about method, technique or science but attitude and that “true leaders don’t seek power but are driven by passion to achieve a noble cause” (Munroe, 2006: p.19).

This type of leadership is much desired in healthcare organizations and government institutions. It has been shown to bring about trust between the leaders and the resulting in increased commitment (Goh & Low, 2014) resulting in employee satisfaction (McCann, Graves and Cox, 2014). Servant leadership style has been applied in educational institutions where it has brought about responsible citizenship behavior amongst employees. The leader voluntarily subordinates himself to team members, remains his normal self while adopting conventional relationships and moral integrity to transform his team members into responsible organization citizens (Nobari,
Mohamadkhani & Davoudi, 2014). The primary function of the servant leader is to serve others and not him. It is based on selfless service so much so that it is seen as servant hood where the leader employs intimate relationship to provide a caring experience to his followers (Goh & Low, 2014).

The study leans on two leadership theories which are the transformational leadership and the transactional leadership theories. This is because elements of all the other leadership theories have been synthesized into these two theories.

**Conceptual Analyses**

We review the concept of leadership effectiveness. From the review and the theories considered in the preceding section, we develop a model for our analyses.

**Leadership Effectiveness**

The whole essence of any style of leadership is for it to achieve its intended purpose of satisfying the needs of individuals within the organization, the needs of the task being carried out and those of groups (Armstrong, 2006). Leadership effectiveness, therefore, involves achieving objectives through the exercise of personal influence in such a manner that satisfies the parties involved (Cooper, 2015). According to Stark (2015), effective leadership involves clearly defining your vision and goals, concentrating on the key areas that are capable of translating your vision and goals into reality and continuously adjusting according to the lessons learnt. Stark stipulated six strategies of effective leadership as follows:

i. Finding people with high followership (great mentors)
ii. Clarifying your leadership vision
iii. Being committed
v. Treating people appropriately which involves recognizing differences in people and treating them accordingly; and
vi. Learning from mistakes.

These strategies compares well with Munroe’s (2006: p.253) Nine attitudes of true leaders which are: Passion, Priorities, Goal-setting, Teamwork, Innovation, Accountability, Persistence, Discipline, and Self-cultivation. Consider also Economy’s (2015) 7 traits of highly effective leaders of Inspiration, Optimism, Integrity, Supportive, Confidence, Communication and Decisiveness. This reinvigorates the usefulness of the traits theory of leadership.
From these two authors we can conclude that leadership is first and foremost, knowing where one is heading to and then convincing and leading people to come along to their benefit and that of the organization. A fundamental element in leadership is, therefore, positive influence. There could be a difference between adopting effective leadership strategies and being effective at leading. This can happen because there are mediating factors between adopting effective leadership strategies and achieving effective leadership. Moreover, true leadership is not necessarily about techniques or strategies but about attitude (Munroe, 2006). Some of these mediating factors include the organization, the society, the culture, the process of becoming a leader, the leader’s skills and the followers’ capacities (Queripel, 2015; Omoijiade, 2015; and Mittal, 2015). Certain outcomes have been used to show effective leadership. These are the level of growth and performance of the group, its ability to handle challenges, group members’ commitment, the group’s psychological well being, the group’s satisfaction with the leader, and the leader’s progress in hierarchy (Abujarat, 2011).

Drawing from the various theories and empirical work reviewed we develop a conceptual framework for this study to include the leadership styles as the independent variable, the leadership effectiveness as the dependent variable while the leadership environment is the mediating variable. From the literature we identify constructs that make up these two major variables and their mediating factors as in figure 1.

![Figure 1: Leadership Styles and Effectiveness](Source: Author’s Model from Literature)
Methodology
The main instrument used to obtain data for this research is a set of questionnaires designed to measure the application of the two leadership styles across the three Universities and their effectiveness. The likert’s scale was used to scale the two variables which enable the assigning of interval measures to variables that, ordinarily, can be measured only by ordinal method. We had a Representative in each of the three Universities who is a staff of the institution to facilitate the administration of the questionnaires. The universities are the Federal University Laffia, the Nasarawa State University Keffi and Bingham University Karu.

The questionnaire contained 36 items, 16 covers Transformational leadership, 9 dwells on Transactional leadership while the remaining 11 concentrates on leadership effectiveness. The 36 items were developed with inputs from Diab’s (2014) Transformational and Transactional leadership questionnaire items, and Cooper’s (2015) and Abujarat’s (2011) leadership effectiveness and Nirenberg’s (2002) classification of leadership influence. There are three universities in Nasarawa State. These are the Federal University, Lafia, the Nasarawa State University and Bingham University, kodape, karu. These make one Federal University, one State University and one private University.

Sample Size Determination
Our Sample size was arrived at using the formula: 
\[ n = \frac{s^2}{(S.E)^2} \]  
where \( n \) = Sample size, \( S^2 \) = Population Variance represented by Pilot Sample Variance and \((S.E)^2\) = Standard error represented by our error level of 0.05 for our desired 95% confidence level (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996). Using the highest standard Deviation of 0.634 our Sample size was, therefore
\[ n = \frac{s^2}{(S.E)^2} = \frac{0.634^2}{(0.05)^2} = \frac{0.402}{0.0025} = 160 \]
A total of 162 copies of Questionnaires were duly completed and returned out of a total of 170 administered giving a response rate of 95.3%. The validity of our instrument was assured through a pretest and peer reviewing. The reliability was measured using the Split-half method (Maimako, 2006). The Split-Half method correlates responses of even-numbered items with odd-number items. We obtained a correlation coefficient of 0.87 in Table 1 which is robust indicating that our instrument could be relied upon for 87% accuracy.
Table 1: Correlations of Odd and Even numbered responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVEN_NO_</th>
<th>ODD_NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVEN_NO_</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODD_NO</td>
<td>0.870329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of Researchers’ Field Survey, 2017

Data Analyses

Descriptive statistics of responses on Table 3 show Mean scores for the two leadership styles and leadership effectiveness of 3.89, 1.423 and 3.278 for Nasarawa State University (NSUK), Federal University Lafia (FED) and Bingham University (BHU). Responses from Bhu has higher variability (Std Dev. 0.634) followed by NSUK (Std. Dev. 0.367) and lastly FED (Std. Dev. 0.353).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Styles and Leadership Effectiveness of three Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>NSUK</th>
<th>BHU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.422778</td>
<td>3.893056</td>
<td>3.277778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.340000</td>
<td>3.850000</td>
<td>3.314286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>2.260000</td>
<td>4.560000</td>
<td>4.380952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0.720000</td>
<td>3.200000</td>
<td>1.809524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>0.352822</td>
<td>0.367119</td>
<td>0.634254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.644808</td>
<td>0.106082</td>
<td>-0.217392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>3.159895</td>
<td>2.027262</td>
<td>2.262403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarque-Bera</td>
<td>2.533015</td>
<td>1.486850</td>
<td>1.099630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>0.281814</td>
<td>0.475483</td>
<td>0.577057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>51.22000</td>
<td>140.1500</td>
<td>118.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum Sq. Dev.</td>
<td>4.356922</td>
<td>4.717164</td>
<td>14.07973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Source: Analysis of Researchers’ Field Survey, 2017

Using the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) method, we regress the two leadership styles of Transformational and Transactional on Effectiveness for each of the three Universities. The results are presented in Tables 3, 4 & 5.

Table 3: Regression Analysis of Leadership Styles and Effectiveness in Nasarawa State University (NSUK)

Dependent Variable: EFFECTIVE
The results of the regression in Table 3 suggest that Nasarawa State University relies more on transactional leadership style for effectiveness more than transformational. The results further indicate that leadership styles contribute to leadership effectiveness, but while transactional is effective with an error probability of 0.0106 which is highly significant (99% confidence level), Transformation has a higher error probability of 0.769 (not significant). On the whole, the model has a predictive ability 70% as indicated by the R-squared value of 0.6985; even when adjusted the predictive ability of our model is still very good at 59.8%. A Durbin-Watson Statistic of 2.28 suggests that there is no autocorrelation within our independent variables. These results support our Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 which state: 1. The Universities adopt both transformational and transactional leadership styles; 2. There is a significant relationship between the adoption of transformational leadership style and leadership effectiveness in the Universities; and 3. There is a significant relationship between the application of transactional leadership and leadership effectiveness in the Universities.

The analysis results for Bingham University suggest that there is inverse relationship between transactional leadership style and leadership effectiveness but when combined with transformational style, leadership effectiveness can be predicted with 99% confidence (error probability 0.0012. Durbin-Watson Statistic is even stronger (2.6083), again indicating the absence of autocorrelation within our Regressors.
Table 4: Regression Analysis of Leadership Styles and Effectiveness in Bingham University (BHU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSACTION</td>
<td>-0.188274</td>
<td>0.063623</td>
<td>-2.959230</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORMATION</td>
<td>0.473926</td>
<td>0.090672</td>
<td>5.226799</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.574870</td>
<td>0.448310</td>
<td>5.743506</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared: 0.919664
Adjusted R-squared: 0.892886
S.E. of regression: 0.114027
Sum squared resid: 0.078013
Log likelihood: 8.596038
F-statistic: 34.34336

Source: Analysis of Researchers’ Field Survey, 2017

Table 5: Regression Analysis of Leadership Styles and Effectiveness in Federal University Lafia (FED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSACTION</td>
<td>1.007217</td>
<td>0.326004</td>
<td>3.089587</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORMATION</td>
<td>0.094806</td>
<td>0.090815</td>
<td>1.043944</td>
<td>0.3367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.358463</td>
<td>0.355088</td>
<td>-1.009503</td>
<td>0.3517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-squared: 0.947532
Adjusted R-squared: 0.930043
S.E. of regression: 0.048515
Sum squared resid: 0.014122
Log likelihood: 16.28717
F-statistic: 54.17801

Source: Analysis of Researchers’ Field Survey, 2017
The results of the regression analysis for Federal University Lafia appear robust with a combined error probability of 0.0000144 indicating a confidence level of 99%. Transactional leadership style was highly significant in determining leadership effectiveness. Transformational leadership style contributed to leadership effectiveness but not significant.

In employing Transformational leadership style, BHU relied more on inspiration followed by Charisma, then individual consideration. Intellectual stimulation was least employed as reported by the respondents. In utilizing Transactional leadership style, respondents report that while Nasarawa State University relied more on training followed by incentives to get results, Federal University Lafia leaned more towards on incentives closely followed by training for leadership effectiveness.

The foregoing results support Hypothesis 4 of our research which state that: 4. There are differences in the Leadership styles employed by the Universities. While two Universities employ majorly, transactional leadership style, the other University relies mostly on transformational leadership style.

**Discussion**

From the results of our analyses, the two Government Universities, one state (NSUK) and the other Federal (FED) both relied more on transactional leadership style for effectiveness while the one private University, Bingham University leaned heavily on transformational leadership style for effectiveness. Transactional leadership involves bargaining use of incentives and training (Arif & King, 2013). In the first place, members of staff in private universities are hardly unionized, and so lack the capacity of bargaining with Management. So you have a united Management directing a fragmented staff. Few attempts at forming associations in the name of Staff Forum have yielded little results as the leaders of such Staff Forums have been made Management staff thereby creating conflict of interests.

In fairness to the Management of private Universities, funding is limited to School fees and the little the Proprietors can provide. In contrast, all Government Universities are heavily funded through budget allocations and Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND) whose mandate reads in part “The Fund administers the tax imposed by the Act and disburses the amount to tertiary educational Institutions at Federal and State levels” (TETFUND Act, 2011) at the exclusion of the private Universities.

So our findings are in tandem with the funding disadvantage of the private Universities, making them to utilize transformational leadership style to drive their institutions to success. Transactional leadership style will fail in a
situation where staff members have to go for three months without salaries (Lewin, 2015; and Armstrong, 2006) on account of poor funding. The private University therefore employs transformational leadership variables of Charisma, Inspiration, Intellectual Stimulation and individualized consideration to galvanize the immense potentials of the employees to achieve success (Diab, 2014; and Arif & King, 2013). At the end of the day, the private Universities are either at par or even higher than the public Universities in terms of academic standards or even infrastructures.

The results of this study agree with earlier works of Ogundele (2006) in Xerox Corporation where he showed significant impact of leadership styles on employees’ performance and invariably organizational development. Ogundele (2006) admitted that there were more variables than organizational styles. This is also supported by our results. In addition to limiting our analysis to leadership effectiveness, the presence of some error level indicates that other variables like leadership credibility (Enonuya, 2011), Executive massaging (Okenwa, 2011) and leadership characteristics/traits and leadership skills (Olubamiye, 2009) impact on leadership styles to determine leadership effectiveness.

Elsewhere, less adoption of transformational leadership by Principals of Secondary Schools resulted in less commitment to duties by Teachers (Zaifada, Mohammed, and Gabadeen, 2015). Our analysis is not a comparison of the two leadership styles since they two styles have been shown to produce results when employed. Other variables that mediate on the effects of the styles and effectiveness were not separately analyzed as they all dissolve into the leadership styles.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

The results of our analyses have shown that both transformational and transactional leadership, when properly employed lead to leadership effectiveness. Transformational leadership was employed by Bingham University, a private University. There was even an inverse relationship between transactional leadership and leadership effectiveness which was also significant. This suggests that the application transactional leadership variables in negative measures resulted in negative leadership effectiveness. Transactional leadership was adopted by the other two Universities (Nasarawa State University and Federal University Lafia) which are both Government Universities.

**Recommendations**

i. University leaders should seek to adopt either transactional leadership style or Transformational leadership or both
ii. In a supportive funding environment, transactional leadership style should be relied upon for leadership effectiveness

iii. In a challenging funding environment, transformational leadership style should be relied upon for leadership effectiveness

iv. Executive support is sine qua non for effective transformational leadership

v. The Federal Government of Nigeria needs to amend the Act establishing TETFUND to accommodate private Universities as they are supporting the Government in providing an essential social service to the Nigerian society. It is not Business as some people think, perhaps due to ignorance of the colossal sums of money required in starting and growing a University and the fact that it can take up 20 years to break even, if at all.

vi. University Leaders need to imbibe other vital variables of leadership effectiveness such as transparency, fairness, selflessness and integrity among many others so that these can distill into whichever leadership styles to enhance effectiveness.
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