DOI: https://doi.org/10.66884/kesj.2021.p1t3s84o

KESJ

Kaduna State University Environmental Science Journal, Vol. 2, 2020

ASSESSING THE INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIAN CONSTRUCTION FIRMS

Olaleye Yetunde Olanike[1], Nazif Amina[2], and Tsaku Joseph Ombugadu[3]
[1,2&3] Department of Quantity Surveying
College of Environmental Studies
Kaduna Polytechnic
Kaduna

ABSTRACT

Leadership plays a vital role in the success or failure of any organization. Lack of effective leadership style leads to poor innovation, low productivity and inability to meet performance targets. Effective leadership enhance employee performance. This study assessed the impact of leadership style on employee performance in Nigerian construction firms. This was achieved by establishing the relationship between leadership styles and employee performance. Five leadership styles and six employee performance measures were adopted for the study. A structured questionnaire was administered to employees of construction firms to identify the leadership style adopted in Nigerian Construction firms and to establish the level of adherence to performance standards. The questionnaire was administered to 328 construction firms in Nigeria, 179 (54.7%) were completed and analyzed. SPSS 22 was adopted for the descriptive statistics while Smartpls3 was used for the inferential Statistics. The result of the descriptive statistics shows that, team leadership style ranked the highest with a grand mean of 4.28. Commitment of employee ranked the highest performance measure with a grand mean of 4.30. The result of the inferential statistics shows that team leadership has the highest number of significant relationships with employee performance thus making it the preferred leadership style for employee performance improvement in Nigerian Construction firms. The study recommended the training and adoption of team leadership style for employee performance improvement.

Keywords: *Construction Firms, Leadership, Leadership Styles, Employee andPerformance*

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is an influential activity that determines the success or failure of firms' endeavors(Javaid, 2012). The effect of leadership cuts across all kinds of social situations especially where the situations demands that people work to achieve common goals. Globally, society generally depends on effective leadership, this cut across several spheres of life such as National development, organizations developments community survival, work function and effective performance (Bushra *at al.*, 2011: Thamrin, 2012). Organizations are established primarily to solve social needs of societies. Currently, the global economy is constantly driven by innovation, performance and productivity. Globalization is making organizations change their structure to compete in the bigger global arena. Institutions either public or private require leaders to drive the objectives for which they were established. A competent leader can achieve organizational goals by overcoming impediments and solving existing problems (Rasool et al, 2015; Otieno *et al.*, 2015). Leadership in organizations is a managerial activity whose purpose is to direct employees in a chain of command towards the achievement of organizational goals (Murray, 2013). It is believed that an effective organization is rooted on the propellers or on the business leaders. Leadership epitomizes a combination of behaviors exhibited by a person who occupies an elected, appointed or designated position of influence in a social system (Jeung, 2012). Leadership can be formally or informally sanctioned. It has been described as a persuasive process where leaders act as an example to motivate

and induce employees to purse the organizational goals. Leaders are integral parts of systems (Lub et al, 2012).

Employee performance involves the execution of defined duties, ability to meet deadlines, competency and work efficiency that can be driven by suitable leadership style (Nkoidila, 2015). Performance of employees depends to a large extent on the leadership style operational in the setting of their organization (Kendra, 2013). Leaders are accountable for the performance of their organizations or the success of their government, these largely depends on the productivity of their employees (Quick & Nelson, 2013). Performance of employees is dependent on effective leadership that can lead employees towards changes and performance improvement. Organizations are in need of strong leadership style that can stimulate the performance of employees (Nkoidila, 2015). Employees perceive the need for effective leaders that gears firms towards changes and performance improvement (Murray, 2013). Lack of effective leadership style usually leads to poor innovation, low productivity and inability to meet performance targets. The need to identify the leadership styles that will suite the performance of employees has been severally highlighted in literatures as observed by Rasool *et al*, (20150 and Tsigu & Rao, (2015). Previous studies have generically examined the relationship between leadership style and performance. Umer et al, (2017) and Adejumo & Ogundipe, (2018) highlighted the need to examine the relationship between individual leadership style and performance measures in construction firms this study intends to fill the gap. This will be achieved by establishing the relationship between leadership styles and employee performance in Nigerian construction firms.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership

Leadership can be viewed as an influential process which distinguish a leader and also gear a group of people to move towards achieving a common or shared goal (Robbin, 2014). A leader is an individual, while leadership is the function that the individual performs. Besides, an individual within organizations who have been ascribed authority are often referred to as a leader, irrespective of theirperformancewhile executing their jobs (Shirazad et al, 2011). The term leadership therefore can be defined as the exercise of influence in a social situation in which the followers' (influences) attribute leadership qualities to the leader (influencer) (Melvyn et al, 2011). Leaders are made based on the fact that other people view them as such. It must be noted that not all leaders are effective managers and not all managers are effective leaders (Muhammad & Usman, 2012). In other words, leadership has been described as a process of persuasion where the leader (or team of leaders) act as an example for a group in order to motivate and induce the group to pursue the objectives of the leader and the organization (Menz, 2012; Bushara et al, 2011). In this regard, it is important to outline the culture of their working environment. They are integral parts of the system in which they arise yet dependent upon two-way communication with constituent and the forces that create the circumstances in which they emerge (Tims *et al*, 2011).

Leadership styles

This refers to the manner in which a person uses power to lead others. Several leadership styles have been identified in literature and they include Autocratic, Democratic, Strategic, Transformational, Team, Cross-Cultural, Facilitative, Laisez-Faire, Transactional, Coaching, Charismatic and Visionary (Muhammad & Usman, 2012; Nkoidila, 2015; Otieno et al, 2015). Shafie *et al* (2013) Identified the leadership styles that exists in construction industry as Coaching Leadership, Visionary Leadership, Facilitative Leadership, Team Leadership and Laisez-Faire leadership. These will be adopted for this study.

Coaching Leadership: This style involves the teaching and supervision of followers. A coaching leader operates in settings where improvement is required for results to be achieved. This leadership style encourages

followers to improve their skills (Serforontein & Hough, 2011). They motivate, inspire and encourage their followers. Coaching leaders encourage followers to try something new on their own. They take personal interest in helping followers maximize their success. Coaching leaders derive fulfilment from the success of their team. Specifically, they motivate members to rise to challenge, uncover hidden talents of team members, build trust and engage team members and understand the true potentials of their team members (Thamrin, 2012).

Visionary Leadership: It is recognized that successful leaders have visionary aspects in them. Visionary leaders accept that the recognition of methods, steps and process of leadership are obtained with and through people. The strive to see their vision transformed to reality (Northhouse, 2014). Unlike ordinary leaders, visionary leaders have eyes focused on the big picture. Visionary leaders strive to build optimistic and inspirational vison and pass it on in an enticing manner to gain followers. Visionary leaders ignite passion in members, are aware of followers' emotions, arrive at creative solutions to problems, encourage followers to 'dream big', see setbacks as stopping points in realizing their visions and create trust among team members (Nusair *et al*, 2012)

Facilitative leadership: This style is dependent on measurements and outcomes and it requires skills to master (Serfontein & Hough, 2011). The effectiveness of the firm largely depends on the efficacy of its processes. The extent of directives issued by a facilitative leader depends on the functionality of the group (Joo, Yoon & Juma, 2014). A highly functional group will require less directive from leadership and vice versa. The leadership style involves the monitoring of group dynamics, offers suggestions and intervention to keep the organization on the right track. Specifically, facilitative leaders encourage critique and improvement, understand how group interaction impact on productivity, seek appropriate involvement in decision making and keep discussions focused, clear and productive (Obiwuru *et al*, 2011).

Team leadership: This involves the creation of a vivid picture for the future of the organization and what it stands for. A team leader inspires and provides a strong sense of purpose and direction. Firms become more effective when they have a common goal and possess ability to resolve conflicts that can disrupt the proper running of the firms (Kendra, 2013). Team leaders choose right employees, delegates effectively, gets employees excited about their goals and ensure employees are given audience when necessary and motivated. Team leaders expand the capabilities of employees, enable and empower groups to accomplish their work efficiently, encourage team members to eliminate low value work, anticipate and influence changes and also inspire towards higher level of performance (Ngethe et al , 2012).

Lessiez-Feire leadership: This is hinged on the fact that effective leaders depend on the ability to allow a degree of freedom to employees. They trust employees to do the jobs themselves and concentrates on the rational aspects of his assignment (Machuki *et al*, 2012). The leaders observe how subordinates perform their duties on their own. This leadership style is characterized by indecision, uncertainty and indifference. Leaders seldom have a clear vision of organizational goal and have no policies. Leaders allows complete freedom to employees to work freely without interference though readily available when help is needed. Lesissiez-Feire leaders abdicates responsibilities, avoid decision making, mostly delegative, are hands off and comfortable with mistakes (Kamarudeen et al, 2011).

Employee performance

This refers to the job-related activities expected of a worker and how well employees execute their activities in accordance with the required standards of their organizations (Ngethe et al, 2012). It is normal for a worker's performance to be evaluated based on standards set by the

organization they represent. This is done basically to identify areas of improvement for employees. Employees performance can be evaluated based on competency, productivity, communication skills, commitment, cooperation and professionalism (Eze, 2010, Jeung, 2012; Lub et al, 2012; Nkoidila, 2015).

Competency: This refers to how well an employee carry out assigned duties, ability to complete assignments with minimal errors and work largely unsupervised. Areas of struggle are identified and solutions sought mostly via training (Shafie et al, 2013).

Productivity: one major function of an employee is productivity. Productivity measures how employees use time effectively, prioritize projects, multi task when necessary, strive to improve skills and ask for suggestions and produce reliable results (Thamrin, 2012).

Communication skills: effective communication is vital for success in any organization. It is necessary for employees to demonstrate the necessary verbal and written skills required for delegated assignments. Assistance should be offered and accepted when necessary, constructive criticism are welcomed, high listening skills are demonstrated, good communication skill is displayed (Eze, 2010).

Commitment: this portrays the actions and intents of employees. Commitment referrers to the level of input by employees. This generally refers to the ability of employees to resume on time and put in a full day's work, adheres to specified dress code when available, accepts errors when they occur, take advantage of further trainings and educational opportunities and make suggestions for improvement (Ghafoor *et al*, 2011).

Cooperation: this refers to the ability of employees to work together with others as a team. Cooperation involves the ability to share and accept responsibilitiestreat others with respect, work to resolve conflicts before it degenerates, prevent third party interference in disputes and ability to work with others (Aboshaiqua et al, 2014).

Professionalism: This refers to the competence or skills expected of professional in the execution of their duties. It is required that employees avoid using company time and resources for personal use, strictly adhere to employee handbook on code of conduct, avoid forming opinion quickly based on single incident and formal evaluation should be adopted as an opportunity for professional growth (Cheung, 2013).

Leadership style and performance

Performance of an employee is dependent on the operative leader. A definite status is established based on the relationship that exist between a leader and the employee (Iheirohanma, Wokoma & Nwakorie, 2014). The central role of a leader and the credibility becomes more prominent in the existing relationship with employees (Achua & Lussier, 2013). Coaching and Visonary leaders augment the level of performance of the employee (Ejere & Abasilim, 2013). According to Rasool et al (2015) There is a direct relationship between the performance of employees and facilitative leaders. Comprehension and motivation by leaders increase the output of employees. Coaching Leaders perform certain functions for the smooth operation and improvements in their firms with the involvement of employees (Ali et al, 2011). Team leaders and visionary leaders influence the performance of employees. Leaders have control or command over their employees and must do all they can to ensure maximum support from employees(Hintea *et al*, 2011). Ultimately, decision making powers lies with leaders. leaders guide employees on what to perform and how to perform, while the employees communicate to the leader their experience and their suggestion if any (Chaudhry & Husnain, 2012). Leaders can entice subordinates to perform and thereby achieve desired outcomes by promising rewards and benefits for the accomplishments of task and administering punishments when task are not well executed. Several relationships exist between leaders and employees and the

relationship ultimately determine the output by employees (Alan, 2013).

METHODOLOGY

The study considered theories and collect data hence the deductive approach was suitable.The data collection process points towards the deductive approach therefore the survey was appropriate for the research process. The survey design allows collection of quantitative data which can be analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The survey method has been applied in research examining aspects of Leadership style(Menz, 2012), Employee performance (Nkoidila, 2015) and relationship between Leadership style and employee performance(Obiwere et al, 2011). In order to utilize the statistical power of the quantitative method the data was analyzed using statistical (quantitative) analysis procedure. This study seeks to establish relationship between different variables (Leadership style and Employee Performance) and this will be achieved by a quantitative approach that will enable the research to formulate the relationship and infer meaning, direction and establish relationship between KM and performance.This study focused on construction organizations registered with the Bureau of public procurement (BPP) of Nigeria.

A total number of 88,424 construction companies are registered with the BPP in Nigeria. Saunders A sample of 383 was drawn from the population at 95% level of confidence. A sample size of 383 is needed to arrive at a sample with a sampling error of at least 5%. This number (383) is further collaborated by the tables presented by (Saunders et al,2009, Cohen et al, 2007) the choice of 383 is consistent with the two tables for a population size of less than 100,000 with 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error.

Thus, a total number of 358 questionnaires were administered and 179 (54.7%) were retrieved and analyzed. The survey instrument (questionnaire) was developed based on the identified concepts, the identified variables were used to construct appropriate measures.

Likert scale was used for each item measured 5 Points representing Strongly Agree and 1 point Strongly Disagree. The descriptive analysis of the data collected were analyzed using SPSS version 22 and the partial least square structural equation modelling (SmartPls 3) for the inferential statistics. SEM will establish the AVE (Average Variance Extracted), R2 , Q2 results, Path Coefficient, T Statistics Results and the Significance of the of each path.

Table 1: Leadership Styles

CODE	LEADERSHIP STYLES	MEAN
Coaching Leadership		
L1A	Motivating members to 'rise to the challenge'	4.22
L1B	Uncovering the hidden talents of team members	4.37
L1C	Building trust and engaging team members	3.90
L1D	Understanding the true potential of team members	3.62
	GRAND MEAN	**4.03**
Visionary Leadership		
L2A	Igniting passion in members	3.88
L2B	Arriving at creative solutions to problems	4.17
L2C	Seeing setbacks as stopping points in realizing the visions of the organization	3.79
L2D	Encouraging followers to 'dream big'	4.10
	GRAND MEAN	**3.99**

CODE	LEADERSHIP STYLES	MEAN
Facilitative Leadership		
L3A	Encouraging self-critique and improvement	4.10
L3B	Understanding how group interactions impact on productivity	4.16
L3C	Seeking appropriate involvement in decision making	4.12
L3D	Keeping discussions focused, clear and productive	3.16
	GRAND MEAN	**3.88**
Team Leadership		
L4A	Expanding the team's capabilities	4.16
L4B	Enable and empower groups to accomplish their work efficiently	4.44
L4C	Encouraging team members to eliminate low-value work	4.32
L4D	Anticipating and influencing change	4.27
L4E	Inspiring towards higher level of performance	4.22
	GRAND MEAN	**4.28**
Leissez-faire leadership		
L5A	abdicates responsibilities	3.72
L5B	avoids making decisions	3.91
L5C	a delegative leader	3.85
L5D	leaders are hands off	3.88
L5E	comfortable with mistakes	3.17
	GRAND MEAN	**3.71**

Source: Field Study (2019)

Table 1 shows the results of the descriptive statistics of leadership styles adopted in Nigerian Construction Industry. The findings show thatTeam leadership is the most adopted leadership style in Nigerian construction Industry with a grand mean of 4.28, followed by Coaching Leadership with a grand mean of 4.03 while Lessez-Faire leadership style ranked the lowest with a grand mean of 3.71.

Table2: Employees Performance Measures

CODE	EMPLOYEES PERFORMANCE MEASUREs	MEAN
Competency		
P1A	Ability to handle assigned workload	4.05
P1B	Completion of assignments with minimal errors	4.22
P1C	Ability to work unsupervised	4.23
P1D	Openness to more training	3.48
	GRAND MEAN	**3.99**
Productivity		
P2A	Effective use of time	2.81
P2B	Ability to prioritize project	2.65
P2C	Multi-tasking when necessary	4.30
P2D	Continuous strive to improve skills and ask for suggestions	4.20
P2E	Ability to produce reliable results	4.09
	GRAND MEAN	**3.61**
Communication skills		
P3A	Demonstration of verbal and written skills required for tasks	4.00
P3B	Ability to offer and ask for assistance when necessary	3.94
P3C	Ability to accept and provide constructive criticism	4.03
P3D	Demonstration of listening skills	4.37
P3E	Display of good communication skills	4.36

CODE	EMPLOYEES PERFORMANCE MEASUREs	MEAN
	GRAND MEAN	**4.14**
Commitment		
P4A	Timely resumption and input of full day's work	4.31
P4B	Adherence to dress code when available	4.36
P4C	Accept error when they occur	4.53
P4D	Take advantage of further trainings and educational opportunities	4.54
P4E	Make suggestions for improvement	3.76
	GRAND MEAN	**4.30**
Cooperation		
P5A	Ability to share and accept responsibilities	3.92
P5B	Treat others with respect	3.06
P5C	Work to resolve conflicts before it degenerates	2.86
P5D	Don't air grievances to outsiders	4.65
P5E	ability to work with others	4.14
	GRAND MEAN	**3.73**
Professionalism		
P6A	Avoid using company time and resources for personal use	4.37
P6B	Strict adherence to employee handbook and code of conduct	4.29
P6C	Quick forming of option based on single incident is avoided	4.22
P6D	Formal evaluation should be adopted as opportunity for professional growth	3.15
	GRAND MEAN	**4.01**

Source: Field Survey (2019)

Table 2 shows the result of the descriptive statistics of employees' performance measures. The result shows that commitment of employees ranked the highest with a grand mean of 4.30 followed by communication skills with a grand mean of 4.14 while productivity ranked the lowest with a mean of 3.61

Table 3: AVE, Composite Reliability, Cronbach Alpha, R^2 and Q^2 results

Construct	AVE	Composite Reliability	Cronbachs Alpha	R Square	Q Square
Coaching Leadership	0.596	0.848	0.797		
Facilitative Leadership	0.579	0.844	0.774		
Leissez-faire leadership	0.508	0.829	0.757		
Team Leadership	0.655	0.892	0.851		
Visionary Leadership	0.538	0.820	0.709		
Productivity	0.587	0.875	0.825	0.429	0.226
Commitment	0.629	0.866	0.793	0.430	0.052
Cooperation	0.550	0.763	0.722	0.496	0.342
Professionalism	0.526	0.740	0.757	0.504	0.008
Competency	0.727	0.914	0.874	0.621	0.018
Communication Skills	0.575	0.810	0.735	0.131	0.059

Source: Field Study (2019)

Internal consistency: The results of the internal consistency also referred to as composite reliability for the firms is presented in Table 3. The scores as presented in Table 3 are as follows: Coaching Leadership 0.848, Facilitative Leadership 0.844, Leissez-faire leadership 0.829, Team Leadership 0.892, Visionary Leadership 0.820, Productivity 0.875, Commitment 0.866, Cooperation 0.763, Professionalism 0.740, Competency 0.914 and Communication Skills 0.810**.**

Convergent validity: Table 3 shows the AVE of the model. The findings show that the 11 constructs meet the minimum 0.50 threshold. Coaching Leadership 0.596, Facilitative Leadership 0.579, Leissez-faire leadership 0.508, Team Leadership 0.655, Visionary Leadership 0.538, Productivity 0.587, Commitment 0.629, Cooperation 0.550, Professionalism 0.526, Competency 0.727 and Communication Skills 0.575.

Coefficient of determination (R^2): The findings indicate that the 5-leadership styles explain 42.9% of the variance in Productivity (moderate), 43% of the variance in Commitment (moderate) 49.6% of the variance in Cooperation (moderate) 50.4% of the variance in Professionalism (moderate) 62.1% of the variance in Competency (moderate) and 13.1% of the variance in Communication skills (weak)

Table 4: Path Coefficients

	Commitment	Communication Skills	Competency	Cooperation	Productivity	Professionalism
Coaching Leadership	0.351	0.312	0.296	0.084	0.156	0.001
Facilitative Leadership	0.420	0.288	0.119	0.464	0.073	0.456
Leissez-faire leadership	0.111	0.343	0.100	0.005	-0.093	0.184
Team Leadership	0.550	0.316	0.261	0.368	0.246	0.330
Visionary Leadership	0.297	0.429	0.584	0.464	0.007	0.071

Source: Field Study (2019)

Table 4 shows the results of the path coefficients. The result shows the path coefficient of the relationship between leadership style and Employee Performance. It indicates that positive relationships exist between the endogenous and exogenous constructs except between leissez-faire leadership and productivity with a negative relationship. The strongest relationship exists between visionary leadership and competency with a path coefficient of 0.584 followed by the relationship between Team leadership and commitment with a path coefficient of 0.550 while the weakest relationship exists between leissez-faire leadership and productivity with a negative path coefficient of -0.093.

Table 5: Mean STDEV, T-Values and SIG Level

	Original Sample (O)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	Standard Error (STERR)	T Statistics (|O/STERR|)	SIG
Coaching Leadership -> Commitment	0.351	0.161	0.161	2.183	**
Coaching Leadership -> Communication Skills	0.312	0.169	0.169	1.852	*
Coaching Leadership -> Competency	0.296	0.163	0.163	1.817	*
Coaching Leadership -> Cooperation	0.084	0.198	0.198	0.427	NS
Coaching Leadership -> Productivity	0.156	0.172	0.172	0.909	NS
Coaching Leadership -> Professionalism	0.001	0.180	0.180	0.003	NS
Facilitative Leadership -> Commitment	0.420	0.166	0.166	2.531	**
Facilitative Leadership -> Communication Skills	0.288	0.246	0.246	1.174	NS
Facilitative Leadership -> Competency	0.119	0.148	0.148	0.806	NS
Facilitative Leadership -> Cooperation	0.464	0.241	0.241	1.929	*
Facilitative Leadership -> Productivity	0.073	0.170	0.170	0.427	NS
Facilitative Leadership -> Professionalism	0.456	0.231	0.231	1.974	*
Leissez-faire leadership -> Commitment	0.111	0.167	0.167	0.662	NS
Leissez-faire leadership -> Communication Skills	0.343	0.163	0.163	2.099	**
Leissez-faire leadership -> Competency	0.100	0.129	0.129	0.778	NS
Leissez-faire leadership -> Productivity	-0.093	0.187	0.187	-0.500	NS
Leissez-faire leadership -> Professionalism	0.184	0.230	0.230	0.800	NS
Team Leadership -> Commitment	0.550	0.144	0.144	3.809	***
Team Leadership -> Communication Skills	0.316	0.146	0.146	2.167	**
Team Leadership -> Competency	0.261	0.132	0.132	1.979	**
Team Leadership -> Cooperation	0.368	0.154	0.154	2.380	**
Team Leadership -> Productivity	0.246	0.147	0.147	1.668	*
Team Leadership -> Professionalism	0.330	0.154	0.154	2.135	**
Visionary Leadership -> Commitment	0.297	0.170	0.170	1.749	*
Visionary Leadership -> Communication Skills	0.429	0.253	0.253	1.696	*
Visionary Leadership -> Competency	0.584	0.179	0.179	3.264	***
Visionary Leadership -> Cooperation	0.464	0.271	0.271	1.714	*
Visionary Leadership -> Productivity	0.007	0.219	0.219	0.030	NS
Visionary Leadership -> Professionalism	0.071	0.262	0.262	0.271	NS

Source: Field Study (2019) Note: NS = not significant. a. Bootstrap confidence intervals for 10% probability of error (a= 0.10). *p < .10. **p < .05. ***p < .01.

Table 5 shows the t statistics and Sig level results associated with each paths result for the firms. A total number 30 path relationships exist between the five leadership styles and six employee performance measures. Eighteen significant and twelve non-significant relationships exists between the exogenous and the endogenous variables. The Coaching Leadership style has three significant relationships with commitment, communication skills and competency, facilitative leadership has three significant relationships with commitment, cooperation and professionalism, leissez-Faire leadership has one significant relationship with communication skills, team leadership has six significant relationships with commitment, communication skills, competency, cooperation, productivity and professionalism. Visionary leadership has four significant relationships with

commitment communication skills, competency and cooperation. The empirical results of the paths significance show that the five leadership styles are significantly related to the six employee performance measures however, team leadership is significantly related to the six employee performance measures followed by the visionary leadership style with four significant relationships. This finding confirms the importance of team leadership and visionary leadership for successful employee performance improvement.

Discussion of findings

This study explored the relationship between leadership style and employee performance in the Nigerian construction industry. Leadership styles have influence on performance of employees (Adejoumo et al, 2018). Specifically, the leadership styles that have significant impact on the performance of employees were established. The findings established that the team leadership style ranked the highest in Nigerian construction firms. The findings are in line with the findings of (Ushie et al, 2010; Joo et al, 2014) whose findings highlighted the importance of team leadership style in employee motivation which ultimately results in improved employee performance. The results also indicate that commitment ranked the highest performance measure in Nigerian Construction firms. This finding is in line with the finding of (Rasool et al, 2015). The study established that team and visionary leadership styles as the most suitable for employee performance improvement in Nigerian construction firms. These findings corroborate the findings of (Otieno et al, 2015) that also identified team leadership style as ideal for employee performance. Team leadership style does not mean that the leaders do not follow the rules and regulations. On the other hand, if the leader adapted visionary leadership style then it not means that they do not motivate and inspire their employees. So, there is need of shared leadership styles which contains the mixture of attributes of both the styles. The leadership with theses shared attributes will strengthen the institutions and thus the quality will be the only result. Lastly, the study found that laissez-faire leadership style does not significantly affect employee performance this corroborates the findings of Maguchi et al (2012).

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to the expansion of knowledge on how specific leadership style influence employee performance in Nigerian construction firms. Commitment and competency of employees were identified as the key employee performance measure in Nigerian construction firms, it further shows that team leadership style influence employee performance in the firms studied as it has the highest number of significant relationships with employee performance measures. To improve employee performance, team leadership style should be adopted in Nigerian construction firms. While the leisses-Faire leadership style has the highest number of non-significant relationships with employee performance and a negative path coefficient.

Recommendations

From the study, the research recommends the following

1. Construction firms are encouraged to adopt the team leadership style as it has the highest number of significant relationships with in the study to influence employee performance.
2. Employee should be given a free hand to contribute or suggest ideas for improvement in their performance

REFERENCES

Aboshaiqah, A. E., Hamdan-Mansour, A. M., Sherrod, D. R. Alkhaibary, A. &Alkhaibary, S. (2014). Nurses' Perception of Managers' Leadership Styles and Its Associated Outcomes." American Journal of Nursing Research, 2 (4), 57-62.

Achua, C. F., & Lussier, R. N. (2013). Effective leadership. (5th ed.). Canada: South Western Publishing

Adejumo, T. M. & Ogundipe, O. A. (2018). Assessing Leadership style and employee performance in the Private sector. Journal of Science, Technology & Education. 7(2). Pp 131-147

Alan, M. (2013). Leadership Styles. International Journal of Business and Social Science 8(7) 105-117.

Ali, H., Ismael, A., Mohamed, S. &Davoud, N. (2011). The impact of Responsibility and Leadership Styles on Leading Change Capability of Malaysian Managers. Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, 1 (2), 70-98.

Bushra, F., Ahmad, U. and Asvir, N. (2011). Effect of Transformational Leadership on Employees' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Banking Sector of Lahore (Pakistan). International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2 (8), 261- 267.

Bizhan, T, Fayeed, T., & Hussain, B. A. (2013) The relationship between leadership style and employee performance case study of real estate registration organization of Tehran province Singaporean. Journal of business economics, and management studies, vol.2, no.5

Bushra, F., Usman,A. & Naveed, A. (2011).Effect of Transformational Leadership on Employees' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Banking Sector of Lahore (Pakistan).International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2(18)

Chaudhry, A.Q., & Husnain, J. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez faire leadership style on motivation. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3(7), 258–264.

Cheung, F. Y. (2013). The mediating role of perceived organizational support in the effects of interpersonal and informational justice on organizational citizenship behaviors. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34(6), 4-4.

Ejere, E. I., & Abasilim, U. D. (2013). Impact of transactional and transformational leadership styles on organizational performance: empirical evidence from Nigeria. The Journal of Commerce, 5(1), 30-41

Eze, H.C. (2010). Leadership in Organization. Journal of Nigerian Institute of Management, 46 (1), 29-35.

Ghafoor, A., Qureshi, T. M., Khan, M.A., & Hijazi, S.T. (2011). Transformational leadership, employee engagement and performance: Mediating effect of Psychological ownership. African Journal of Business Management, 5 (17),7391 – 7304.

Hintea, C.E., Hudrea A. & Balica D.O. (2011). Patterns of control in the Romania executiveagencies: an exploratory research.Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences, Special Issue on Agencies in Central and Eastern Europe

Iheriohanma, E.B.J., Wokoma, C.U., & Nwokorie, C.N. (2014). Leadership Question and the Challenges of Community Development in Nigeria,European Scientific Journal, 10(35): 204 – 216.

Javaid, M. F. (2012). Leadership style enhances the employee organizational commitment: A case study of educational institutions in Lahore. Journal of Management, Statistics and Social Sciences, 1 (1), 64-77.

Jeung, C.-W. (2012). The effects of core self-evaluations and transformational leadership on organizational commitment. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 33(6), 564–582.

Joo, B.-K., Jun Yoon, H., & Juma, V. (2014). Jubilee Holdings Scouts for Acquisition Targets in Africa. Business Daily Africa. Research Journal of Social Science and Management 4 (6),

Kamaruddin, N., Zaherawati, Z., Nazni, N., Mahazril, A.Y., Jamaludin, M., & MohdZoolHilmie, M.S. (2011). The future challenges of local authorities in Malaysia. African Journal of Business Management, 5(26), 10841-10845.doi: 10.5897/AJBM11.1445.

Kendra, C. (2013). What is Laissez-Faire Leadership? (On-line: http:// www. Psychology.about.com/od/leadershi p/f/ lasissez-faire-leadership.htm).

Lub, X., NijeBijvank, M., Matthijs Bal, P., Blomme, R., & Schalk, R. (2012).Exploring the psychological contract and commitment of different generations of hospitality workers. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 24(4),553–573.

Machuki, V. N., Aosa, E. O., & Letting, N. K. (2012). Firm-Level Institutions and Performance of Publicly Quoted Companies in Kenya. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2(21).

Melvyn, R.W.H., Nico, W.V.Y., Barbara, W. & Kai, S. (2011). Transformational Transactional Leader styles and Followers' Regulatory Focus: Fit Reduces Followers' Turnover Intentions. Journal of Personnel Psychology, 10 (4), 182-186.

Menz, M. (2012). Functional Top Management Team Members: A Review, Synthesis, and Research Agenda. Journal of Management, 38(1), 45-80.

Muhammad, F.J. & Usman, M.M. (2012). Leadership Styles Enhances the Employee Organizational Commitment. International Journal and Conference Management, Statistics and Social Science, 1-26.

Murray, A. (2013). The wall street journal guide to management: lasting lessons from the best leadership minds of our time. New York: Harper Collins Publishers

Ngethe, J.M., Namasonge, G.S. & Mike, A.I. (2012). Influence of Leadership Styles on Academic Staff Retention in Public Universities in Kenya. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3 (21), 297-302.

Nkoidila, N. A. (2015). The role of social capital on the operational performance of smallholder dairy producer groups in Kajiado and Githunguri cooperative society.

Northouse, P. (2014). Leadership Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Nusair, N., Abaaneh, R. & Bae, Y. K. (2012). The Impact of Transformational Leadership style on Innovation as Perceived by Public Employees in Jordan. International Journal of Communication and Management, 22 (3), 182-201.

Obiwuru, T.C., Okwu, A.T., Akpa, V.O. & Nwankwere, I.A. (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.

Otieno, B. B. A., Waiganjo, E. W., & Njeru, A. (2015). Effect of Employee Engagement on Organisation Performance in Kenya's Horticultural Sector. International

Journal of Business Administration, 6(2).

Quick, J. C. & Nelson, D. L. (2013). Principles of Organizational Behavior: Realities & Challenges. UK: Cengage Press. Rasool et al (2015) Leadership styles and its impact on employee's performance in health sector of Pakistan city. University research journal volume 05 number 01 january 2015 article 08.

Rasool, H. F., Arfeen, I. U., Mothi, W., & Aslam, U. (2015). Leadership styles and its impact on employee's performance in health sector of Pakistan. University R search Journal, 5(1)

Robbins, S. P. (2014). Organizational Behavior. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Saunders, M. Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2009). Research Methods for business students. 5th edition, Prentice Hall, London

Serfontein, K., & Hough, J. (2011). Nature of the relationship between strategic leader ship, operational strategy and organizational performance.South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences, 14(4), 393-406.

Shafie, B., Baghersalimi, S. & Barghi, V. (2013) The Relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Performance. Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies, 2, 21-29

Shirzad, T. Kebria, B.; & Zanganeh, F.; (2011). The relationship between senior managers leadership style of school districts of Tehran and spirit of the administrators in girls state school. Journal of Management Research and Training.

Thamrin,(2012) The Influence of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance, International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, 3(5)

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthoplou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? Leadership Quarterly 22,121-13.

Tsigu, G. T., & Rao, D. P. (2015). Leadership styles: their impact on job outcomes in Ethiopian banking industry. ZENITH International Journal of Business Economics &Management Research, 5(2), 41-52.

Umer, U.P., Adnan,Q., Anam, M., Inam-ul, H. & Hamid, W. (2017). Impact of Leadership Style (Transformational and Transactional Leadership) on Employee Performance and Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction: Study of Private School (Educator) in Pakistan. Global Journal of Management and Business Research, 12 (4), 54-64.

Ushie E.M., Agba, A.M., Ogaboh, A.M., Agba, M.S. & Chime, J. (2010). Leadership Style and Employees' Intrinsic Job Satisfaction in the Cross-River Newspaper Corporation, Calabar, Nigeria. International Journal of Development and Management Review, 5 (1), 61-73.