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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this project was to determine the effects of leadership styles on organizational development. The following research objectives guided the study: the effect of autocratic leadership style on organizational development, effect of transactional leadership style on organizational development, the effect of intellectual stimulation on organizational development and the effect of bureaucratic leadership style on organizational development. Literature review was presented based on the specific research objectives.

The study had a population of 122 middle level managers of Uchumi Supermarket; descriptive survey design was adopted for the study while stratified sampling method was deployed in selecting the sample size of 96 respondents. The study used both inferential and descriptive statistics whereby inferential statistics analyzed correlations and regressions, descriptive statistics analyzed mean frequencies and standard deviation.

From the first objective the study established that respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the leader fully seeks input from employees, it was however agreed that leaders almost make all of the decisions, the study also revealed that the group heads dictate all the work methods and processes. It was agreed that rules are important and tend to be clearly outlined and communicated Repondents however failed to confirm whether creativity from the employees tend to be discouraged. From the second objective it was however agreed by a majority that leaders almost make all of the decisions, majority agreed that leaders like to micromanage. The findings also show that leaders discourage new ways of doing things within the firm (change) and leaders appeal to the self-interest of employees.

Based on the third objectives, the finding indicated that majority agreed (M=4.15) that the leaders suggests new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals, it was also agreed that leaders highlight positive outcomes. It was however disagreed that leaders create a conducive environment to support creation and sharing of knowledge. The findings from the fourth objective established that the leaders prefer formality in reporting, in addition, decision making is made by the leaders alone without involving employees. There was however uncertainty over leaders preferring stability and order within the organization.
The study concluded that leaders at Uchumi supermarkets have not fully sought input from employees as a result the leaders make all of the decisions. Similarly, there seem to be issues of trust between the management and employees, this has resulted into employees rarely being entrusted with decisions that are regarded important and crucial. Secondly, leaders have failed to give a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project, thus implying that they discourage independent thinking. Thirdly, at Uchumi, leaders suggest new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals and the leaders highlight positive outcomes. Employees are also not certain of the leaders encouraging innovation and creativity. Lastly, leaders prefer formality in reporting, in addition, decision making is made by the leaders alone without involving employees.

The study recommends that leaders should fully seek input from employees and at the same time make all of the decisions. The service industry is dynamic, therefore creativity from the employees should be highly encouraged. Secondly, in order to motivate employees, it is of essence that leaders should give a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project. Thirdly, it is advisable that the leaders need to suggest new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals. Lastly, formality in reporting should be highly encouraged however when it comes to decision making, leaders need to involve all employees.

The current study studied the impact of leadership styles on organizational development in Uchumi Supermarket. Similar study should be done to determine other factors that affect organizational development in the firm. In addition, there is a need to do a similar study in other supermarkets in order to be able to generalize the findings.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
I would like to acknowledge my supervisor Professor Katuse for his guidance on how to successfully develop the report.
DEDICATION

I dedicate this research project to my friends and family for their support.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

STUDENT DECLARATION ........................................................................................................... ii
COPYRIGHT .............................................................................................................................. iii
ABSTRACT ............................................................................................................................... iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ........................................................................................................... vi
DEDICATION ........................................................................................................................... vii
LIST OF TABLES ....................................................................................................................... x
LIST OF FIGURES ..................................................................................................................... xi

CHAPTER ONE .......................................................................................................................... 1
  1.0 INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................................ 1
  1.1 Background of the study .................................................................................................... 1
  1.2 Statement of the problem ................................................................................................. 5
  1.3 General objective ............................................................................................................. 6
  1.4 Research Objectives ....................................................................................................... 6
  1.5 Significance of the Study ............................................................................................... 6
  1.6 Scope of the Study .......................................................................................................... 7
  1.7 Definition of Terms ........................................................................................................ 7
  1.8 Chapter Summary .......................................................................................................... 8

CHAPTER TWO .......................................................................................................................... 9
  2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW ..................................................................................................... 9
  2.1 Introduction ..................................................................................................................... 9
  2.2 Autocratic Leadership Style and Organizational Development ................................... 9
  2.3 Transactional Leadership Style and Organizational Development ............................ 14
  2.4 Intellectual Stimulation and Organizational Development ........................................ 19
  2.5 Bureaucratic Leadership Style and Organizational Development ............................ 22
  2.6 Chapter Summary ........................................................................................................ 26

CHAPTER THREE ...................................................................................................................... 27
  3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ....................................................................................... 27
  3.1 Introduction ................................................................................................................... 27
  3.2 Research Design ............................................................................................................ 27
3.3 Population and Sampling Design .................................................................27
3.4 Data Collection Methods ..............................................................................29
3.5 Research Procedures .....................................................................................30
3.6 Data Analysis ..................................................................................................30
3.7 Chapter Summary ............................................................................................31

CHAPTER FOUR ........................................................................................................32
4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS ..............................................................................32
4.1 Introduction ......................................................................................................32
4.2 Response Rate ..................................................................................................32
4.3 Demography ....................................................................................................32
4.4 Effect of Autocratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development ........34
4.5 Effect of Transactional Leadership Style on Organizational Development ....35
4.6 Effect of Intellectual Stimulation on Organizational Development ..............36
4.7 Effect of Bureaucratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development .......37
4.8 Correlation Analysis .......................................................................................38
4.9 Regression Analysis .........................................................................................39
4.10 Chapter Summary ...........................................................................................44

CHAPTER FIVE .........................................................................................................45
5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..................45
5.1 Introduction ......................................................................................................45
5.2 Summary of the Findings ...............................................................................45
5.3 Discussions ......................................................................................................46
5.4 Conclusions .....................................................................................................53
5.5 Recommendations ............................................................................................54

REFERENCES .........................................................................................................56
APPENDIX 1: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE .....................................................65
LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Response Rate
Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics of Effect of Autocratic Leadership Style
Table 4.3: Descriptive of Effect of Transactional Leadership Style
Table 4.4: Descriptive of Effect of Intellectual Stimulation
Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics of Bureaucratic Leadership Style
Table 4.6: Correlation Analysis
Table 4.7: Model Summary of Autocratic Leadership
Table 4.8: Anova Analysis of Autocratic Leadership
Table 4.9: Coefficient of Autocratic Leadership
Table 4.10: Model Summary of Transactional Leadership
Table 4.11: Anova Analysis of Transactional Leadership
Table 4.12: Model Summary of Intellectual Stimulation
Table 4.13: Anova Analysis of Intellectual Stimulation
Table 4.14: Coefficient of Intellectual Stimulation
Table 4.15: Model Summary of Bureaucratic Leadership
Table 4.16: Anova Analysis of Bureaucratic Leadership
Table 4.17: Coefficient of Bureaucratic Leadership
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1: Respondents Gender ........................................................................... 32
Figure 4.2: Respondents Age ............................................................................... 33
Figure 4.3: Respondents Departments ................................................................. 34
Figure 4.4: Respondents Work Experience ............................................................. 34
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The link between organizational development and leadership style lies on the right execution of leadership roles in driving the success of an organization. Different leadership styles have divergent effects on business enterprises across the globe (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). The different styles may attract productivity or affect the general performance of the business organization. The leadership approaches have a direct effect on employees at a business organization, and can create a corporate culture that will affect the general organizational performance (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). By applying any leadership style, the management can influence and affect motivation, effectiveness and the general productivity of its employees (Adenyi, 2016).

The connection between organizational development and leadership style in an organizational setting can be found where the management may choose to use a typical business approach in their offices while incorporate other styles in different departments (Willcocks, 2018). Understanding the various leadership styles and the impact in the organizational setting is significant since it can help analyze and trigger effectiveness. According to Amagoh (2009) leadership style is the way a leader provides directions, implementing of plans and motivating people within the firm to pursue organizational goals. It entails not only influencing of performance of a company but also triggering of the morale of employees, their productivity level, and influencing the process of decision-making and its metrics. Brauckmann and Pashiardis (2011) regards leadership style as a pattern of a leader relating with the subordinates. Specifically, it consists of how the leader directs and controls how the subordinates conduct their respective assignments as well as how the subordinates gets them in order to produce desirable results as intended.

Organizational development and leadership offers an interactive team supports creation of team skills and collaboration among individuals as they work together to accomplish the organizational goals and objectives (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). Organizational development and leadership also help in developing strengths of the followers and leadership qualities through identification of abilities and challenges that help with personalized improvement in terms of performance, loyalty and influence among the followers (Dexter, 2007). Leadership style plays a key role in developing talent and creativity in the organization,
hence, making it crucial in the organizational development activities (Lok & Crawford, 2009).

The leadership style is the methodology used in the organization to achieve its objectives (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). Successful leadership approaches can then influence the general performance of the organization. By reviewing the business leadership style, it is possible to determine its impact on the organizational development and performance (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). Leadership styles are influential factors that play the central role in the success or failure of the business enterprise. In this view, leadership styles are the critical management skills in leading groups on the organizational setting. Leadership enhances the accomplishment and attainment of the organizational goals. Leaders influence the institutional strategies and eventual effect in the organizational development (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015).

Organizational leadership is defined as the focused management approach that helps business enterprises to achieve their goals (Shulhan, 2018). In organizational leadership, business managers use different styles and techniques to motivate their staff with intent to motivate while obtaining organizational success. In this view, it is evident that an organization operating in a competitive market will try to use an organizational leadership model (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). Therefore, many business managers will try to develop an understanding of the immediate competitive environment. In lieu of this understanding, it is right to say that the business managers usually develop a worldview of their businesses (Adenyi, 2016).

Similarly, in business management, leadership efficiency dictates the success or failure of an organization (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). Administrative supervisors in the business environment can also affect the performance of the organization. Various studies around organizational management indicate that a leadership style may impact the development of a business enterprise (Marques, 2015). In this view, it is evident that leadership style of an organization can improve the performance of the business. Businesses contribute to the growth and development of world economies depending on the leadership approach used by its managers. In light of these acknowledgements, it is apparent that the fate of organizational success depends on the leadership approach (Krishnan, 2018). Different styles of leadership have different sets of consequences. (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). Each style of leadership has a unique kind of...
consequence to an organization and it is each style is employed to produce a certain consequence.

Organizational development requires leadership with some form of consistency. (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). Leadership is rather a consistent behavior and it has to be exhibited in the management or the person in leadership. Leadership styles and individual character are not mutually exclusive (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). A leader’s character influences his style of leadership in a great way. For a positive impact on organizational development the leadership styles to work, a leader must possess such traits as charisma, understanding and democratic and passion (Lussier & Achua, 2013). Charisma tends to take the form whereby the leader can infuse and induce a positive and invigorating kind of energy to a group in which he or she is tasked to lead (Singhry, 2018). An understanding leader has an effect of having a better grasp on the individual talents, capabilities and needs in the organization. The leader with this kind of characteristics will always focus on the positive energies of the individuals thereby understanding on their different potentials. The overall effect is obvious, there is increased productivity in the group or the organization as each individual will focus on their purpose employing their unique talents in the organization (Obaga, 2016).

Organizational development is cannot be achieved in a desirable manner if the organization lacks leadership style which consists of the manner in which instructions are provided as the approaches and techniques used by the leader in motivating the staff and ascertaining that the given instructions are executed (Strielkowski & Chigisheva, 2016). There is difference between management and leadership. Management tend to focus on promoting stability and empowerment of the firm to run smoothly, while on the other hand, the main function of leadership is to stimulate, promote and managing of the initiatives to do with the long-term change (Kihara, 2016). The role of a leader is to inspire, train and motivating the followers in order to have their support while making important long-term vision driven by collative decision making (Pearce & Robinson, 2013).

Messick and Kramer (2014) argues that the degree to which a person exhibits the traits of leadership varies not only on their characteristics and personal capabilities but also on the attributes of the situation and the environment that they find themselves in. Achua and Lussier (2013) on the other hand they have defined leadership as the process of
influencing both the leaders and followers in achieving the organizational objectives through change. They further defined influence as the process by which a leader communicates ideas, gain acceptance, and ability to motivate followers in supporting and implementing the ideas through the change process.

The rapid expansion of the Kenyan middle class triggered a constant growth in revenue sales as indicated by statistics from the retail sector. As a result, the service industry in Kenya continues to register tremendous growths (Krishnan, 2018). The service sector rakes up as being a major employer and a tax remitter to the national government as recorded from general observations. The example of the Kenyan services industry helps to evaluate the impact of leadership style on organizational development (Gachingiri, 2015). The case study of Uchumi supermarket helps to illustrate how leadership can promote organizational development. Importantly, by reviewing the example of the Kenyan supermarkets and the impact of organizational leadership, it is possible to depict the impact of leadership at the business level (Gachiri, 2015).

Uchumi Supermarket Limited is a Kenyan based organization that is engaged in the retail supermarket operations since its establishment in 1976, the retail outlets supplies various products ranging from vegetables, bakery, fish, meat, house appliances, wines, and decoration appliances (Obaga, 2016). The shareholders of Uchumi Supermarket most of them being government owned parastatals came together and entered into a management contract with Italian company SPA, with its leading supermarket presence in Europe, they were given a task of managing and training Kenyan personnel that was in-charge of operations in Uchumi Supermarkets in Kenya (Gachiri, 2015).

With a good vision of bringing the hypermarket experience in the East African region, in early 2010 Uchumi Supermarket began to experience operational and financial difficulties occasioned by the expansion strategy that was associated by weak internal control mechanisms and as a result, in 2016, the Board of Directors resolved that the organization ceases its operations despite having placed the company under receivership (Obaga, 2016). Simultaneously, Capital Markets Authority (CMA) also suspended the organization’s listing on the Nairobi Securities Exchange (NSE) which was followed by a framework agreement between the government of Kenya, the suppliers and debenture holders, but the company was revived under specialized Receiver Manager to work tirelessly in redeeming the company from a negative bottom line (Wafula, 2011).
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Leadership is critical in business management, making it the subject of discussion. By reviewing the impact of the leadership style used in a business organization, it is easy to make a comprehension of how organizations behave given the contribution from their leaders (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). It is also easy to predict the success or failure of the organization by attributing its routine operations from the leadership style used (Shulhan, 2018). The retail industry has had a very stiff competition in the recent past with companies ensuring survival of their operations by being creative and innovative, proactive and unique in their in their strategy implementation as well as execution (Gachingiriri, 2015).

Based on the analysis of the previous studies, they have highlighted the importance of leadership style in managing commitment among them being Githuka (2017) who conducted the study on the effects of leadership styles on employee commitment on Non-Government Organization, and found out that there was a positive relationship between the leadership and employee commitment in the organization, Waris (2016) conducted a study on the impact of leadership qualities on employee commitment in the multi project based organizations and found out that the traits of leaders dictated the kind of commitment employees have at the workplace, Dunn (2012) on the other hand, carried out an empirical study on the impact of leadership on employee’s commitment to organization, Asra and Kuchinke (2016) conducted a study on the impact of leadership styles on employees’ attitudes towards their leader and performance in Pakistan banks, their findings revealed that there is a significant relationship that exist between transformational leadership and the outcomes of employee performance and another study done by Wachanga (2017) on the influence of leadership styles on performance of the insurance projects indicated that there was a significant relationship between transformational, democratic leadership and employees performance outcomes.

However, it appears that studies done previously focused on examining the link between leadership styles and organizational development in the context of retail industry. The retail industry is unique sector in terms of its service offerings; hence, this study seeks to establish the impact of leadership styles on organizational development in Uchumi Supermarket.
1.3 General Objective

The general objective of this study was to determine the impact of Leadership Styles on organizational development in Uchumi Supermarket.

1.4 Specific Objectives

The following objectives guided the study.

1.4.1 To determine the effect of autocratic leadership style on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket.

1.4.2 To determine the effect of transactional leadership style on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket.

1.4.3 To determine the effect of intellectual stimulation on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket.

1.4.4 To determine the effect of bureaucratic leadership style on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study was significant to the following stakeholders.

1.5.1 Uchumi Supermarket

Uchumi Supermarket stands to benefit from the findings of this study since they are able to gain insights on the effects of various leadership styles that impact its performance and be able to strategically choose the ideal leadership style that is appropriate for their organizational needs as well as development.

1.5.2 Retail Industry

The Kenyan retail industry is also a beneficiary of the findings of from this study; the industry will gain knowledge on the role of leadership style on organizational performance. They are able to identify the appropriate leadership style that is in line with the organizational objectives for them to meet their desired goals.
1.5.3 Policy Makers

Policy makers also benefit from the study by knowing the impact of leadership style on organizational performance, hence, create policies that will accommodate various leadership styles in both the private and public sector.

1.5.4 Researchers and Academicians

Researchers and academicians can use this study for their literature review, testing their hypothesis and confirming the same findings on the impact of leadership style on organizational performance.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study focused on the top level management, the middle level management and the low level management in determining the impact of leadership style on organizational performance at Uchumi Supermarket. The study was conducted at Uchumi Supermarket Headquarters office in Nairobi.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Organizational Leadership

Organizational leadership is defined as the focused management approach that helps business enterprises to achieve their goals. It is also a dual focused approach to management that is aimed towards what is best for individuals working within the organization and what is best for the group as a whole (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011).

1.7.2 Organizational Development

Organizational development refers to a systematic planned growth within the company that positively enhances a realization of the company objectives and at the same time enabling individuals working in the organization to acquire desired skills and knowledge that impacts their personal capacity growth (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014).

1.7.3 Leadership Style

The leadership style is the methodology used in the organization to achieve its objectives and successfully influences the general performance of the organization (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014).
1.7.4 Uchumi Supermarket

Uchumi Supermarket Limited is a Kenyan based organization that is engaged in the retail supermarket operations since its establishment in 1976, the retail outlets supplies various products ranging from vegetables, bakery, fish, meat, house appliances, wines, and decoration appliances (Obaga, 2016).

1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the background of the impact of leadership styles on organizational development. Statement of the problem has also been highlighted, followed by the general objective of the study which is to determine the impact of leadership styles on organizational development in Uchumi Supermarket and the specific research objectives guiding the study have also been presented. The chapter also covers the significance of the study, highlights the scope and provides definition of key terms used in the study.

The next chapter presents the literature review based on the specific research objectives introduced in chapter one.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This being the second chapter of the study, the chapter will present the literature review on the impact of leadership style on organizational development. The first section of the chapter presents the literature on the effects of Autocratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development; the second section will present the literature review on the effect of Transactional Leadership Style on Organizational Development; the third literature will focus on the effects of Intellectual Stimulation on Organizational Development. At the end of the chapter, it is the summary highlighting the content covered in chapter two for this study.

2.2 Autocratic Leadership Style and Organizational Development

Alonderiene and Majauiskate (2016) argue that the backbone of an organization is leadership and it is significant should not be underrated. It is true that leadership has been identified as the most significant subject in the discipline of organizational behaviors. Leadership is one of the remarkable concepts that exploit the dynamic effects during individual and organizational effects. In that regard, the ideology of the management to execute depends entirely on leadership capability (Kihara, 2016). Many scholars have premeditated this phenomenon, but there is no conscious definition of what leadership is, no dominant paradigm for studying it, and little agreement regarding the best strategies for developing and exercising it. Some of the authors state that leadership style remains viewed as the combination of traits, characteristics, skills, and behaviors that leaders use when interacting with their subordinates (Maamari & Saheb, 2012). On the other hand, some of the human resources veterans’ scholars view leadership to be a reciprocal process of social influence, in which leaders and subordinates influence each other in order to achieve organizational goals.

According to Shah (2016) in his study of impromptu leadership influenced by a collaborative search, he defines an autocratic leader as the one who is very conscious of his position and has little trust or faith in the subordinates, he feels that pay is just a reward for work and it is only the reward, which can motivate. In another word, they are the type of leaders who have the tendencies of commanding and expect compliance. For
that result, all the decision pertaining to the running of the organizations depends on them and no suggestions of initiatives are entertained from the subordinate. Autocratic management are trustworthy where they want the subordinate to take instructions as they say. In addition, that line of reasoning, these leaders have no occurrence it in leadership since they remain appointed to the leadership position or responsibility bestowed that involves managing people (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). The rights for making decisions remain retained by the autocratic leaders. The ideology of autocratic type of leadership has the capability of harming and destroying an institution with a negative repercussion as they coerce the employees to accomplish tasks and objectives in a very shallow way, build upon personalized objectives (Gachingiri, 2015).

According to Marques (2015) leaders with high competence and high goals for the organizations tend to have more pressure on the employees for the high production of the organization so that they can align with his dream. This ideology remains mostly achieved by the tight budget, personal ceiling, and budget cuts. Managers who deploy strict measures seem to be faced by resistance, strikes, and high turnover since most of the times the staffs tend to protest against dictatorial leadership. Autocratic leader provides a vision for employees to use as motivation for achieving goals (Obaga, 2016). The vision can be as limited as accomplishing monthly sales goals to being as comprehensive as expanding to include international locations within a predetermined period (Voyer & McIntosh, 2013). In addition, this type of leadership tends to presents the benefits and challenges of achieving company goals and inspires the staff to work toward visions of future success.

Leadership style plays an important role in the business environment. Company owners often develop a leadership style to run their organization and manage employees. An autocratic leadership style relies on one individual to make decisions in a business. Small businesses often use an autocratic leadership style because the business owner is responsible for all business decisions (Gachingiri, 2015). An autocratic leadership style is a more authoritative management style (Singhry, 2018). Business owners use autocratic leadership to ensure all employees are on the same page with the business owner. Autocratic work environments usually have little room for flexibility. Business owners use this management style to ensure all goods or services remain produced in a consistent manner. As a result, the leaders tend to develop more complex but smart goals and
objectives of the organization so that the organization is capable of achieving its vision according to their core values, mission, and millennium goals (Amagoh, 2009).

Policies, procedures, and guidelines are natural extensions of an autocratic leader (Obaga, 2016). These rules help enforce the leader’s management style. Since all the decision-making authorities’ lies on the hand of the autocratic leaders, they are capable of speculating on their roadmap to achieving their vision within a short period. The vision and mission of their organization motivate most of the business industries (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). Therefore, it is the responsibility of the leaders to ensure that all the rules and the regulation pertaining to the achievement of the organizational goals are accomplished within the speculated period (Gachingiri, 2015).

2.2.1 Organizational Control

According to Arif (2016) business owners and shareholders employ an autocratic leadership style to ensure they have full control of their business. Autocratic leadership does not rely on several people to make a decision in urgent business situations. Business owners can assess the company under current economic decisions to make critical business decisions (Voyer & McIntosh, 2013). Other businesses in the economic environment may prefer professional relationships with a worker directly with the business owner. Business owners usually become the face of an organization in an autocratic leadership environment. Since this type of leadership encompasses zero involvement of the individuals in decision-making, big business employs this type of management since they are capable of controlling all activities in the organization (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). As a result, the type of leadership is a vital aspect that plays a significant role in the achievement of the organizational vision.

2.2.2 Organizational Performance

The definition of organizational performance corresponds to measurement practices in strategic management research because majority of researchers assess organizational performance based on economic indicators (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). Micheal (2013) suggest a consistent organizational framework with three dimensions: accounting returns, stock market performance, and growth. Accounting returns are defined as the historical performance of organizations that are assessed with financial accounting data as published in annual reports. Dexter (2007) argue for a single accounting returns
dimension, whereas other studies identify several dimensions that remain derived from accounting returns indicators. Organizational Performance has remained defined as comprising the actual output or results of an organization as measured against its intended goals and objectives (Klagge, 2007). Organizational performance covers three explicit areas of industry results; financial performance being profits, return on assets, and return on investment, product market performance in terms of sales, and market share; and shareholder return in terms of total shareholder return, and economic value added (Brown & May, 2012). It is likely to experience poor organizational performance due to the exercise of autocratic leaders in the organization. This is as a result, of poor management and engagement of the employees who work to ensure that the objectives and goals of an organization remain achieved. Therefore, the theoretical domain of organizational performance remains specified only by relating this construct to the broader construct of organizational effectiveness (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014).

2.2.3 Employee Turnover

According to Lok and Crawford (2009) the nature of leadership influences individuals’ intention to leave or stay in an organization or engage fully in the company. Poor relationship leadership style is a product of autocratic leadership style or production centered leadership flair serves as one of the main important reasons why employees leave their jobs or resort to deviant behaviors. Similarly, antagonistic relationship between leaders and subordinates can cause employees to lose commitment and satisfaction with their jobs (Amagoh, 2009). The number one reason of why people quit their job is that their bosses treat them poorly. Those who remain in their jobs working for poor bosses have lower job satisfaction, lower commitment, psychological distress and subsequently high turnover intentions (Adenyi, 2016).

Incompetent leadership results in poor performance, high levels of stress, low commitment, low job satisfaction, high turnover intentions. Time after time, leadership in organizations plays significant roles in employee motivation and retention especially if employees receive a regular positive feedback and recognition (Amagoh, 2009). A supervisor’s positive attitude toward subordinate employees improves the employees’ attitudes toward work, their leader, and the organization. In turn, the employees develop intrinsic motivation and a good match between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation results in job satisfaction and a stronger propensity to stay with the employer (Joiner & Josephs,
Participatory decision-making is one of the measures by which management can minimize employee turnover intentions. Participation is a process in which decision-making is shared among individuals who are not generally considered to have equal status in the organization and it is a function of democratic leadership style. The outcomes of participatory leadership style are numerous but notably are employee motivation and reduction in turnover intentions (Taormina, 2008).

2.2.4 Strategy Implementation

At the center of any strategy execution is the employee of the organization (Gachiri, 2015). The employees are the backbone of the operation and the performance of the organization. The management of the organization designs the strategy of the organization and it is always the task of the employee to execute the strategy. Before designing a strategy, there has to be consultation from outside the organization and most importantly from within the organization (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). Internal consultations are important in that they are the light to the strength of the organization. By strength of the organization, it refers to the capacity of the organization to execute the strategy wholly by the regards of the talents that are possessed in the organization. The analysis goes as far as defining the weakness of the executors of the strategy and also the success rates the strategy may have (Dexter, 2007).

Leadership styles affect in totality the strategy execution of the organization. As is with any organization, the leadership of the organization possesses a complex relationship with the employees of the organization. The relationship between the leadership of the organization and the employees of the organization largely depends on the style of leadership engaged upon the organization. In the words of Validova and Pulaj (2018), autocratic leadership styles breeds about a poor relationship between the leadership/management of the organization and the employees of the organization. This is largely attributable to the fact that there exists no consultation between the leadership thus the development of the strategy and executors of the strategy who are the employees (Brauckmann & Pashiaridis, 2011). To a large extent the leadership of the organization needs to involve the executors of the strategy in not only the implementation of the strategy but wholly in the design of the strategy. The lack of consultative engagement between the leadership of the organization and the employees of the organization brings
about the poor design and implementation of the organization strategy (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011).

Poor strategy design has immediate and future consequences on the organization (Adenyi, 2016). Effects of this based on the style of leadership has far reaching consequences in both the persons who are directly involved with the organzation and also to the persons who are not directly involved in the organization. In this regard, there has to be a careful approach when designing and dealing in a directive or a policy to avert the consequences that may be brought about by in the future, either immediate or later to the organisation or the community around the organisation (Adenyi, 2016).

2.3 Transactional Leadership Style and Organizational Development

According to Allio (2012) transactional leaders elucidate for their clique the followers' responsibilities, the expectations the leaders have, the tasks that must remain accomplished and the benefits to the self-interests of the followers for compliance. Transactional leaders usually operate within the boundaries of the existing system, emphasize process rather than substance as means of control and are successful in stable and predictable environments (Brown & May, 2012). The primary factors of transactional leadership model include contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire (Brown & May, 2012).

Most leaders who tend to engage on transactional leadership tend to focus on low order construct such as the entire broad performance goals and objectives since they lack enough experience to focus on the higher level of the organizational vision (Amagoh, 2009). In any way these leaders are found in this type of situation, they tend to think of the strategic processes to find a novel way to encourage their subordinates to work towards that vision. However, in most cases, they emphasize on specific goals and performance outcomes such as an increase in team productivity and establishment of effective working relationships within the groups (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). Importantly, transactional leaders expect their followers to have attributes such as commitment to goals, the expectancy of goal attainment, the expectancy of rewards and need for role clarity. In order to achieve the highest subordinate performance, these leaders use rewards and punishments as tools (Gachingiri, 2015). In any recital breakdown, transactional leaders tends to play a significant role to lack of objectives and opportunity of a remuneration from the side of the follower and therefore they respond with goal setting,
instruction, and training, work assignment and reward or punishment. Tahsildari, Hashim, and Normeza (2014) have shown that transformational leadership proves to have a strong positive impact on innovative work behavior and organizational innovation.

2.3.1 Motivation

The empirical study conducted by Dulewicz and Higgs (2015) indicates that the untimely stage of transactional leadership is negotiating the contract whereby company gives the employee a wage and other benefits. Transactional leadership is like bureaucrats leadership. It is a sense of power and controls direct orders. Transactional leadership makes clear that what is required and expected from their subordinates. It also mentions that subordinates will get an award if they follow the orders seriously. Dexter (2007) asserts that sometimes punishments remain not mentioned but they remain to understand. In the early stages of transactional leadership, the subordinate is in the process of negotiating the contract. The contract specifies fixed salary and the benefits that will remain given to the subordinate. Rewards remain given to subordinates for applied effort. Some organization use incentives to encourage their subordinates for greater productivity. Transactional leadership is a way of increasing the performance of its subordinates by giving those rewards (Gachingiri, 2015).

With transactional leadership, there are two factors, contingent reward, and management by exception (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). Contingent reward provides rewards for effort and recognizes good performance. Management by exception maintains the status quo, intervenes when subordinates do not meet acceptable performance levels and initiates corrective action to improve performance. The transactional style of leadership was first described by Max Weber in 1947 and then by Bernard Bass in 1981. The managers most often use this style. It focuses on the basic management process of controlling, organizing, and short-term planning (Amagoh, 2009).

Transactional leadership remains also called as 'true leadership style as it focuses on short-term goals instead of long-term goals. Transactional leadership has more of a 'telling style'. Transactional leadership is because reward or punishment is dependent on the performance (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). Even though researchers have highlighted its limitations, transactional leadership remains used by many employers. According to Kihara (2016) more and more companies are adopting transactional leadership to increase the performance of its employees. This approach is prevalent in the real workplace.
Transactional leadership, when the leader assigns work to its subordinates, then it is the responsibility of the subordinate to see that the assigned task is finished on time. His work also shows that if the assigned task remains not completed on time or if something then punishment remain given for their failure. Nevertheless, if they accomplish the task in time then the subordinates remain given a reward for successfully completing the task. Subordinates are also given an award and praised for exceeding expectations. A subordinate whose performance is below expectation remain punished and some action maintain taken to increase his or her performance (Michael, 2013).

Farid, Tasawar, Shahid and Abdul (2014) researcher sought to find the effect of Transformational Leadership on Employee Motivation in Telecommunication Sector in Punjab. The study hypothesis indicated that there is significant relationship between Transformational Leadership and Employee Motivation. By applying the regression analysis of independent and dependent variable it was revealed that there is positive and significant relationship between employee motivation and transformational leadership.

A study by Adeel, Ghulam and Muhammad (2017) study was intended to find out impact of transformational leadership on employee motivation in banking sector of Pakistan. Data about relationship of transformational leadership with employee motivation in Allied Bank Limited, Habib Bank Limited and National Bank of Pakistan. Regression analysis revealed that all dimensions of Transformational Leadership positively impacted on Employee Motivation which proved that Transformational Leadership has significant, positive and strong effected employee motivation in the Banking sector of Pakistan. Study also revealed existence of a positive and strong relationship of all dimension of transformational leadership such as Idealize Influence, Individual Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation and Inspirational Motivation with employee motivation. The paper concluded that it is all in the hand of organization to keep the employees motivated to work because they can develop such policies that lead to motivation of employees.

2.3.2 Increased Action-to-Action and Outcome-to-Outcome Expectancies

According Adenyi (2016), expectancy theory, the author reveals the process of making choices by an individual. According to this work, the expectancy of an individual remains derived by valence, expectancy, and instrumentality. This work provides insightful information on the notion of the relationship that exists between rewards and performance. This proposes that employees engage in particular behaviors based on the
probability that the behavior will remain followed by that certain outcome and the value of that outcome (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011).

Expectancy theory relies mainly upon extrinsic motivators to explain causes for behaviors occurring in the workplace. When the rewards are highly valued by the employee, this will enhance the probability of triggering self-motivation. The leader is therefore responsible to provide the salience of various rewards to attract employees. The transactional form of leadership tends to deploy the ideology of coercive method to influence the behaviors of employees in the working place (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). When there is the need for the change in the organization the mechanism that remains used in the changing is the top-down program that seems to improve action-to-action among the employees in the organization.

In the midst of the various theories of leadership and motivation relating to effective organizational management, perhaps the most prominent is the transformational-transactional theory of leadership (Joiner & Josephs, 2007). Scholars explain transformational-transactional conceptualizes by deploying two factors to differentiate “ordinary” from “extraordinary” leadership: transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership remains based on conventional exchange relationship in which followers’ compliance (effort, productivity, and loyalty) maintain exchanged for expected rewards. In contrast, transformational (extraordinary) leaders raise followers’ consciousness levels about the importance and value of designated outcomes and ways of achieving them (Dexter, 2007). They also motivate followers to transcend their own immediate self-interest for the sake of the mission and vision of the organization (Gachingiri, 2015).

Transactional type leadership style majors on the enlargement of followers and their needs. Managers who seem to practice transactional leadership set their focal point on the development of value system of employees, their motivational level and moralities with the development of their skills (Kihara, 2016). In the consideration of the concept that is gained in the human resource field, transactional leadership style acts as a bridge between leaders and followers to develop the clear understanding of followers’ interests, values, and motivational level. As a result, the followers achieve their goals in the organizational setting (Amagoh, 2009). As a result, the ideology of the action-to-action and outcome tend to be fully exploited because the organizational leaders don’t depend on the
employees to execute what they are commanded instead they are also put the hand in the same ideology to ensure that they achieve their goals and objectives. Additionally, the interesting part of this type of leadership is that leaders can understand needs, present organizational visions, enact regulations and delegate substantially to their followers. Moreover, transformational leaders know how to create an effective and meaningful work for creativity and development (Gachingiri, 2015).

2.3.3 Increased individual and organizational reward

Transactional leadership style majors on the benefit and rewards that the subject gets in the workplace (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). Transactional leadership is a two way form of leadership whereby the employee gets a reward from an effort accomplished whereas the employer gets satisfaction form a reward (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). In the process the organization stands to benefit from the efforts employed and thus organizational objectives are steered to the front (Gachiri, 2015).

Organizations are engaging entities whereby they rely on the relationship between the management and the implementers or the executors of the policy (Peet, 2012). The seamless and fruitful interaction of the leadership of the organization and the workers of the organization enhances inclusivity in the levels of management in the organization and that overall impacts decision making by the management of the organization (Gottlieb, 2012). The management can field their thoughts on some aspect of the decision and also the workers of the organization can have a chance in contributing to the aspect of policy in the organization. By this, the policy becomes all-inclusive in that it picked up the aspect and thought of every individual in the organization and come up with a concrete policy (Taormina, 2008).

The implementation of the policy and management directives thereby become easy as each and every individual is conversant with them and that general effect is that the outcomes are always positive. There is always a positive overall effect to this kind of engagement. This in the sense that there is a value addition to the chain in the organization and also there is an intricate addition to the workers in the organization who are directly involved in working out the policy and directives in the organization (Xue, Bradley , & Liang , 2011). The workers will feel more encouraged to continue with the organization policy development and implementation and in the sense increase the positive output by the organization.
Gathii and K'Obonyo (2017) study investigated the moderating effect of organizational reward systems on the relationship between transformational leadership and firm performance. The empirical study employed a questionnaire approach. The Sample for the study was drawn from a population of 404 Telecommunication firms registered under the Communications Authority of Kenya (CAK) as at June 2014. Regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses in a sample of 202 firms. The findings suggested that Transformational leadership has a direct and significant effect on firm performance. In addition, organizational reward systems were found to have no significant moderating effect on overall firm performance and financial firm performance. However, the moderating effect of reward systems on the relationship between transformational leadership and nonfinancial firm performance was significant.

2.4 Intellectual Stimulation and Organizational Development

Sandvik and Selart (2018) indicate that intellectual Stimulation is the concept that involves the encouragement of the leaders in the organization to embrace the ideology of creativity and innovation with an aim of using the same system to achieve the organizational goals and objectives. This ideology is vital in the business platforms because this concept attempts to arouse the notion of creative thinking an aspect that is seeing most of the current organization to remain ranked as the most superior organizations (Amagoh, 2009). In addition, intellectual stimulation attempts to offer the importance in the line of arousing followers' thoughts and imagination, as well as stimulating their ability to identify and solve problems creatively (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011).

For that point of view, intellectual stimulation remains demonstrated when leaders attempt to encourage their employees to be creative and innovative and they are also going down to try the new approach and challenges their own beliefs and values (Taormina, 2008). Importantly, this ideology tends to promote problem solving by finding out the creative solution. Intellectual stimulation is an attribute of transformational leaders who build up capability followers, motivate creative thinking to generate innovative ideas, and teach how to think about a variety of things with a new alternative. The transformational form of leaders forever and a day hearten internal learning climate through the provision of necessary requirements (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). All the way through intellectual stimulation, followers maintain challenged to find new ways of doing their job. The followers remain challenged with the question, whether they are in line
with the goals of the organization in general. Intellectual stimulation will amplify the aptitude of subordinates to comprehend and solve the problems; they are also thought infuriating and imaginative exercise, including changes in values and beliefs (Alondieriene & Majauskaite, 2016).

2.4.1 Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge Sharing is an essential part of acquaintance management (Sandvik & Selart, 2018). Knowledge sharing remains defined as a series of actions taken by workers in disseminating applicable information to other employees within the company. In another word, knowledge sharing is as a cultural social interaction through knowledge change actives, skill, and experience of employees in all departments of the organization (Peet, 2012). The type of leadership that remains exploited in an organization is one of the essential factors that affect organizational knowledge sharing activities. Diverse studies have found out the importance of top management support on the same ideology. In essence, knowledge sharing process will be effective if supported by transformational leadership styles through intellectual stimulation (Adenyi, 2016).

Intellectual stimulation remains built on high-quality exchange relationships between leaders and members have an important role in the development of relational identification of employees and organizational identification, which in turn will increase knowledge sharing activity. Previous research has proved that intellectual stimulation has an influence on knowledge sharing activities (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). Intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and confidence among members of the organization can encourage organizational learning. Intellectual stimulation challenges to become professionals in their field are having an influence on learning activity. Intellectual stimulation remains positively related to team performance (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). Intellectual stimulation refers to the leaders challenge to developed assumptions, risk takers and to gather some follower ideas, employees must be willing to challenge the status quo, not avoid the risks and be willing to share an understanding of consumer needs and the changing environments (Brown & May, 2012).

2.4.2 Innovation

According to Amagoh (2009) Knowledge sharing through intellectual stimulation is a vital activity in an organization since it will promote a new way of dealing with problems
of organizations. Again, since knowledge sharing seems to remain supported by diverse leadership style, it remains viewed as an important resource of an organization. Comprehension division among workforce will augment rapid rejoinder to customer needs at a lower cost in operation (Lok & Crawford, 2009). The face-to-face interface in the process of knowledge sharing remains done between individuals within an organization to share experiences and knowledge to obtain new knowledge, core competencies, problem-solving skills, learn new techniques, and starting new situation (Kihara, 2016).

Prior research in the circumstance of the affiliation between innovation support effective knowledge sharing and innovation (Amagoh, 2009). Prior research suggests that knowledge allotment of employees will contribute to the appliance of science and gain the competitive advantage (Klagge, 2007). Knowledge sharing with knowledge collecting dimensions has a significant effect on all types of innovation, as well as knowledge donating that occurs in groups or group level has an influence on innovation. Explicit and tacit knowledge sharing affect the pace of innovation and quality innovation. Knowledge donating and knowledge collecting affect the company's innovation capabilities. Working experiences of employees will directly influence the higher level of team creativity and produce different products (Shulhan, 2018).

In the competitive environment, it has remained agreed that the ideology of producing innovation and industry performance innovation plays a significant role in the attainment of the competitive advantages in the business platforms (Xue, Bradley, & Liang, 2011). Groundbreaking companies tend to have the aptitude to become accustomed to market change, having shorter decision chains and faster inflexibility. In broad-spectrum, modernization can utilize the potential of existing resources, improve the efficiency and potential value, and it can remain regarded as a new intangible asset for the organization (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). Various empirical studies show that the innovation of the company will be able to increase business performance. Product diversification is capable of mediating the connection between export diversification and firm performance (Klagge, 2007).

Researchers evaluate that firms with the superior technology will be more victorious in responding to consumers’ need, so it could develop new capabilities to achieve better performance or superior benefits. Innovation performance has a significant and positive
impact on corporate performance (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). The innovation of new products or services will improve corporate performance through the reduction of operating costs and quality of customer satisfaction. From that point of view, it is clear to argue that the faster the company introduces new products and service the faster the company will improve its performance. Again, the ideology of innovations influences the company's pecuniary performance, which is a return on assets and return on sales (Adenyi, 2016). Product and process innovation has a strong relationship to company performance. Product innovation remains influenced by emotional and learning ability, which is finally having a momentous influence on business performance (Michael, 2013).

Consequently, intellectual stimulation is regarded as one of the factors that play a significant role in the success or failure of any business. Leadership is a crucial management skill of leading a group of people or a company towards a common goal (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). Leadership involves establishing a clear vision for the organization, sharing the vision with others in order to follow willingly, providing necessary information, methods and knowledge and coordination as well as the balance of conflicting interests of all the members of the company and its stakeholders. A leader is then an individual that directs, influences and motivate the followers to perform specific tasks and inspires subordinates for efficient performance towards attaining the objectives of the organization (Gachingiri, 2015).

The type of leadership in an organization determines the successful implementation of strategy that the organization has chosen to execute. Leaders have a strong influence in carrying out the operations of the organization (Pearce & Robinson, 2013). Leaders set goals, the objectives and strategies that will drive the vision that is intended to be attained through its strategy, since, they are the ones who take part in making such decisions, these include; recruitment and selection of staff, setting targets and among other critical issues that are vital for the success of the organization. Poor leadership, therefore, it indicates poor performance while a good leadership reflects the success of the organization.

2.5 Bureaucratic Leadership Style and Organizational Development

Bureaucratic leadership style refers to the style of leadership that is based upon fixed official duties within a hierarchy of authority, and the application of the system for managing the organization as well as decision-making (Gottlieb, 2012). This style of leadership is common in all public sector organization whereby each person employed
seem to have a fixed kind of duty and he or she is expected to act as instructed to bring out the common good of the organization (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). The order emanates from the top duty officials and passed down through various channels to the subordinate officials of the organization. The communication hierarchy from the subordinate members of the organization to the superordinate members of the organization is also in such hierarchy as the communication is passed from one official to another in their superiority up to the top management of the organization (Amagoh, 2009).

Bureaucracy relies upon the division of labor in the aspect that each individual is tasked with a certain type of work or responsibility and he or she is expected to implement the task as it is required (Peet, 2012). Bureaucracy always has everyone with a defined role in the organization and that the roles are distinct from each other. In this aspect everyone performs clearly defined roles and that the roles are rarely overlapping each other (Brown & May, 2012). Bureaucracy in the sense requires some form of sternness whereby the rules and roles are enforced onto an individual by the person in the senior position to the person in the junior position (Adenyi, 2016).

Despite some of the characteristics associated by bureaucracy conflict with some of the principles of leadership, some have argued that the effect of bureaucracy on the leadership abilities can be reduced with diversification of leadership style rather than relying upon one kind of leadership (Adenyi, 2016). According to Amagoh (2009) the question should not be whether they should lead but rather the kind of leadership that the administrators practice. That is, the leadership style by just itself it is not an issue, but the issue will lie in the accommodating style to lead the followers (Klagge, 2007).

Nevertheless, one of the most significant principle of leadership is the capability of being creative and innovative (Dexter, 2007). Leaders need to be creative and allow the call for innovation in their companies while in the same context, creativity will require a high level of autonomy among employees in the organization, however, some of the main negative attributes associated with bureaucracy is its effect on innovation and autonomy (Sandvik & Selart, 2018). The capability of employees to innovate in the organizations attributed with bureaucracy can be limited with various regulations within the company. Consequently, the autonomy of employees is highly restricted by the bureaucracy kind of regulations, regardless if the company has an ambitious leader or a promising style of
leadership, the bureaucracy may still be a major obstacle (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016)

2.5.1 Hierarchy

As is with this kind of leadership, it relies heavily on hierarchy whereby the information and the instructions pass through a channel, usually involving persons in their rank of seniority to reach the executor and the feedback is relayed to the management of the organization through the same channels (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). In the words Klagger (2007), hierarchy in the organization takes the process whereby various levels of authority and responsibility are required and well defined. Hierarchy in bureaucracy takes the form whereby there has to be a subordinate and a superordinate whereby the subordinate and the superordinate in which the chain of instruction takes place (Awan & Mahmood, 2010).

In bureaucratic leadership, the role in the hierarchical position is based on position (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). An individual’s role in the organization is dependent upon the position he or she holds in the organization. If the individual is in a superior position, he or she expects subordination form the persons who are below them in the hierarchy of leadership and often the loyalty of the subordinates is also expected (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). In this formation of leadership, the instructions are from the superior to the juniors and all the instructions from the seniors are expected to be followed to the letter. What is stated by the superiors is almost as law meaning it cannot be questioned or changed by the subordinated in the hierarchy and that it is expected of the subordinates to follow instructions from their seniors without question. Bureaucratic style of leadership relies on the need to refuse any form of questioning or change for them to remain in a stable state (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). Any suggestion to change by the juniors in the hierarchy is strictly opposed and in instances the juniors are treated to the threats in order to maintain the stability. The seniors have the absolute authority.

2.5.2 Formalization

At the center of activity of any organization is the formulation of rules to govern the operations in the organization. Formalization takes the form of developing the guiding principles that will govern the conduct and the workings of the organization. In the
definition by Dulewicz and Higgs (2015), formalization is the process of formulating the laws and rules to govern the operations in the organization. In another definition by Michael (2013), formalization is the process of developing the regulating rules in the organization to govern the working relationship in the organization. Formalization is the process of defining the clear rules in the organization and defining the exact expectation of the employees in the organization by clearly defining their roles and thus implementing on the objectives in the organization (Brown & May, 2012). In all the definitions, formalization has characteristics of defining the rules in the organization and thus formalizing on the working principles in the organization. There is clear stipulation of the rules to be followed and boldly lists out the sanctions that will be put in force in an event that the rules are not followed. Each action of not following a rule has a clear consequence (Adenyi, 2016).

The process of formalization works to regulate the workforce in the organization and increasing the awareness of the description of the job required of the workers of the organization, the managements works to achieve overall efficiency in the different fields of operation (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). Tasks thus are able to be met with ease as different members of the organization are aware of what is required from him or her in the organization (Amagoh, 2009).

In regards to formalization, it poses a great setback in the organization (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015). Top in the setbacks of the organization is the effect of formalization to inhibit innovation by the employees of the organization. Formalization is such that the organization defines roles for each and every individual and fixes them to the rules and expects results from them (Taormina, 2008). The employees of the organization can therefore not wander to other fields not subscribed to them thereby limiting their potential, talent and capability to innovate (Strielkowski & Chigisheva, 2016).

2.5.3 Centralization

Centralization and formalization in the organization are completely dependent on each other (Dexter, 2007). In the definition by Kaparou and Bush (2015) centralization is the process in which power is concentrated within the management group of the organization. A few number of the individuals usually the top in leadership and management in the organization wields the power and the influence in the organization (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). The power and influence is exerted to the rest of the workers in the organization.
usually the subordinates. Usually the fewer the number of the persons in the focal point of decision making in the organization, the more established centralization is in the organization. (Xue, Bradley, & Liang, 2011)

Numerous studies have been undertaken to establish the impact of centralization in the organization (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). Some have argued that centralization is of major benefit to the organization whereas others argue that centralization has adverse effects to the organization. The positive impact of centralization is that decision making is limited to only a few who know on the workings of the organization (Adenyi, 2016). In the research by Kaparou and Bush (2015) centralization does not require so many consultations in order to form a decision but requires just a few who are at the position of leadership to formulate the decision and enforce the decision on the subjects.

According to Kaparou and Bush (2015) the downside of centralization is that, key decision can be lacking in that they did not involve all the persons for the organization who could play better advisory roles to the management thus building an all-round decision for the organization. Centralization has been developed and emerged as a central component in organizational leadership. Its formation has an assumption and a clearly spelt out rule of who the leader of the organization is and the process of assumption of new leadership into the organization (Gachingiri, 2015).

2.6 Chapter Summary

The chapter presented the literature review on the effects of leadership style on organizational development. The literature on the effect of autocratic leadership style on organizational development, followed by the literature on the effect of transactional leadership on organizational development then the effect of intellectual influence on organizational development and lastly the effect of bureaucratic leadership style on organizational development. The next chapter presents the research methodology.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the research methodology that was used for this study. The methodology covers the research design that will guide the researcher on how the study was carried out, population of the study, the sample size and sampling technique, research procedures and data analysis methods that was used in analyzing the collected information.

3.2 Research Design
Research design is the approach or framework that is utilized by the researcher in data collection and analysis of the data with the aim of answering the research objective or research questions guiding the study (Cooper & Pamela, 2014). The research design can be useful in providing justification of the choices made by the researcher in data collection and analysis of the data (Bryman & Bell, 2007). This study used descriptive survey design as its selected research design. Descriptive survey was chosen by the researcher since it will support the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data without influencing the environment on which the study was conducted. Thornhill, Saunders and Lewis (2013) define survey as the data collection method that uses a questionnaire to gather data from a specified sample of the population to draw inferences of the study based on its objectives.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population
Population refers to the total collection of units, objects or individuals on which inferences can be drawn by the researchers (Thornhill, Saunders, & Lewis, 2013). A population can also be defined as the total units that forms the study subject on which the researcher wishes to investigate. The target population of this study was 122 employees combining senior managers and middle level managers that work in Uchumi Supermarket in Nairobi. The study sought to interview nine senior managers, 34 middle level managers, seventy one supervisors and eight departmental heads.
3.3.2 Sampling Design

Sampling design refers to the blueprint on how sampling of the study was conducted (Thornhill, Saunders, & Lewis, 2013). The activity of sampling involves selection of elements or items that form the study population which is the representation of the entire population on which the study is to be carried on (Walliman, 2010). Sampling design covers the sampling frame, sampling technique and the sample size.

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Thornhill et al., (2013) defines a sampling frame as the final list that offers the representation of the population of the study from which a sample size is determined. The final list can have different groups that are homogeneous and heterogeneous in nature. The sampling frame of this study was obtained from the Human Resources Office at Uchumi Supermarket.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

Sampling technique is the technique that the researcher use in ensuring that all different groups which are both heterogeneous and homogeneous are well represented in the final sample size that the study used in data collection (Cooper & Pamela, 2014). This study used stratified random sampling in ensuring that all the middle level managers from various departments are well represented in selecting the respondents of the study.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

Sample size is the smaller units of the entire population on which inferences can be drawn with an attempt of addressing the research questions or objectives (Cooper & Pamela, 2014). Sample size relies upon the level of accuracy, the kind of analysis and the total population of the study form which a sample was determined. This study used Yamane’s formula in determining the sample size with a confidence level of 95%.

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \]

Where \( n \) = sample size
N= Population, 122 in this case

e = alpha level, 0.05

To substitute the values into the equation, an estimate sample size of this study is:

\[ n = \frac{122}{(1 + 122 (0.05^2))} \]

\[ n = 93 \]

Based on the Yemen’s Formula, the sample size of the study has been determined. The sample size of this study is 93 respondents.

**Table 3.1: Sample Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Areas</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Distribution</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Managers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level Managers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.4 Data Collection Methods**

Cooper and Schindler (2014) define data collection as the process of collecting all data form the identified respondents in a manner that is systematic to effectively address the research questions or specific objectives of the study. This study will utilize a structure closed ended questionnaire based on Likert Scale of five measurement levels that is Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree. The questionnaire used will include five sections while the first section covering the demographic information of the respondents, the second section will cover the questions of the first objective, followed by the third section covering the questions of the second objective. The fourth section had questions of the third objective and the last section questions on the fourth objective as presented in chapter one.
3.5 Research Procedures

Research procedures refers to the detailed description including step by step that will guide how the study was carried out to meet the objectives of the researcher by effectively addressing the research objectives. For this particular study, after completion of the research proposal, approval from the supervisor was obtained, then a letter of introduction was drafted to the human resource manager of Uchumi Supermarket to allow mw conduct the study on their premises.

After that a pilot study was carried out to test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. 9 respondents from the sample size was used in carrying out the pilot study and the in case there was any inconsistency with the questionnaire as an instrument, adjustments was made before being administered to the respondents for the actual study. The next step is the researcher to visit the office of Uchumi Supermarket and locate the respondents, then explain why the research is being carried out and the purpose it intends to fulfill.

A drop and pick method was used id data collection, the researcher will drop the questionnaires at the respondents and give them a maximum of four days to be fill them, a follow up was made within the timeframe to make sure the respondents are filling their responses. Then questionnaires was collected, checked if they are dully filled, in case there is any missing details from the respondents a follow up was done to obtain the missing information from the respondents. Then all the questionnaires was gathered for the researcher to analyze the collected data and information.

3.6 Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of reducing the raw data into meaningful information that addresses the research objectives or questions (Thornhill, Saunders, & Lewis, 2013). This study will make use of both inferential and descriptive statistics in analyzing the collected data with the help of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings was presented in form of tables and figures.
3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the research methodology that will guide the researcher on how to carry out the study. First, a research design has been highlighted, population of the study being 122 employees has also been presented. Sampling technique, sample size of 96 respondents has been presented, data collection methods whereby a questionnaire was used, research procedures and data analysis methods have all been presented in this chapter. Chapter four of this study will present the results and findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results established from the data analysis that was done. This included demographic results and response on the specific research objectives aimed at establishing the impact of leadership styles on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket.

4.2 Response Rate
The research distributed a total of 93 questionnaires to all respondents however only 80 were filled and returned giving a response rate of 86%. This was sufficient for the study as indicated in table 4.1

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled and returned</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Demography

4.3.1 Respondents Gender
An analysis of the respondent’s gender established that majority of respondent’s accounting for 56% were female while male accounted for 44% as shown in Figure 4.1 as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: Respondents Gender
This indicated a minimal disparity with regard to gender thus implying a low bias in the response received.

4.3.2 Respondents Age

As indicated in Figure 4.2, an analysis of the respondent’s age established that a majority of respondents accounting for 50% were aged between 31-40 years while 26.3% were aged between 41-50 years. It was also established that those aged between 18-30 years accounted for 16.3% of the total, while those aged between 51-60 years were only 7.5%. This findings implied that the most of the employees in the supermarket were still young therefore able to offer their services for many years to come and thus minimizing turn over.

![Figure 4.2: Respondents Age](image)

4.3.3 Respondents Departments

An analysis of the departments represented in the study established that all the departments were represented however majority of respondent’s accounting for 27.5% represented the sales department while 20% represented finance department, in addition 18.75% represented operations department while 17.5% represented customer service department, in addition, marketing department has 10% representation while IT department had a 6.25% representation as as shown in Figure 4.3.
4.3.4 Respondents Work Experience

To establish the number of years respondents have worked for the firm, the findings revealed that majority had 4-6 years experience representing 37.5%, those who had 7-9 years experience were 27.5%, and those of 1-3 years were 20%, in addition, those with 10-12 years were 10%, and the least represented were respondents with 13-15 years experience who had no representation. This implied that respondents had the necessary experience in the field.

Figure 4.4: Respondents Work Experience

4.4 Effect of Autocratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development

The first objective sought to determine the level of agreement on effect of autocratic leadership style on organizational development. To achieve this a five point likert scale
was utilised where 5- Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree.

4.4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Effect of Autocratic Leadership Style

The study revealed that respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the leader fully seeks input from employees (M=3.04), it was however agreed that leaders almost make all of the decisions (M=4.11), the study also revealed that the group heads dictate all the work methods and processes (M=3.94). There was uncertainty of wether employees are rarely trusted with decisions that are regarded important and crucial (M=3.23), nor work being structured and very rigid (M=3.31). It was agreed that rules are important and tend to be clearly outlined and communicated (M=4.03). Repondents however failed to confirm wether creativity from the employees tend to be discouraged (M=3.13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The leader fully seeks input from employees</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders almost make all of the decisions</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group heads dictate all the work methods and processes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are rarely trusted with decisions that are regarded important and crucial.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work tends to be structured and very rigid</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules are important and tend to be clearly outlined and communicated.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity from the employees tend to be discouraged.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Effect of Transactional Leadership Style on Organizational Development

The second objective sought to determine the level of agreement on effect of transactional leadership style on organizational development. To achieve this a five point likert scale was utilised where 5- Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree.
4.5.1 Descriptive of Effect of Transactional Leadership Style

It was established that most respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the leader gives a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project (M=3.20), leaders discourage independent thinking (M=3.06), leaders reward performance based on specific goals and targets set (M= 3.01), and leaders are focused on maintaining the status quo within the entire organization (M=3.15). It was however agreed by a majority that leaders almost make all of the decisions (M=4.08), majority agreed that leaders like to micromanage (M=3.75). The findings also show that leaders discourage new ways of doing things within the firm (change) (M=2.89) and leaders appeal to the self-interest of employees (M=2.59).

Table 4.3: Descriptive of Effect of Transactional Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The leader gives a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders almost make all of the decisions.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders discourage independent thinking.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders discourage new ways of doing things within the firm (change).</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders reward performance based on specific goals and targets set</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders are focused on maintaining the status quo within the entire organization.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders like to micromanage.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders appeal to the self-interest of employees.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Effect of Intellectual Stimulation on Organizational Development

The third objective sought to determine the level of agreement on effect of transactional leadership style on organizational development. To achieve this a five point likert scale was utilised where 5- Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree.
4.5.1 Descriptive of Effect of Intellectual Stimulation

The finding indicated that majority agreed that the leaders suggest new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals (M=4.15), it was also agreed that leaders highlight positive outcomes (M=3.98). There was however uncertainty about leaders allowing employees to look at issues from various angles (M=3.15), the leader allows different perspectives when solving problems (M=3.40), the leader encourages teamwork among employees (M=3.49), leaders encourage innovation and creativity (M=3.30). It was however disagreed that leaders create a conducive environment to support creation and sharing of knowledge (M=2.75).

Table 4.4: Descriptive of Effect of Intellectual Stimulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The leader allows employees to look at issues from various angles</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suggests new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader allows different perspectives when solving problems</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leader encourages teamwork among employees</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders highlight positive outcomes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders encourage innovation and creativity</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders create a conducive environment to support creation and sharing of knowledge.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Effect of Bureaucratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development

The fourth objective sought to determine the level of agreement on effect of bureaucratic leadership style on organizational development. To achieve this a five point likert scale was utilised where 5- Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, 1- Strongly Disagree.

4.7.1 Descriptive Statistics of Bureaucratic Leadership Style

The study established that the leaders prefer formality in reporting (M=4.08), in addition, decision making is made by the leaders alone without involving employees (M=4.15).
There was however uncertainty over leaders preferring stability and order within the organization (M=3.39). At the same time majority disagreed that leaders embrace written procedures and policies (M=2.90) nor leaders discourage innovation (M=2.98). It was also disagreed that employees are promoted based on the ability to conform to the rules of the office (M=2.75).

Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics of Bureaucratic Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The leaders have created a well-defined dominance hierarchy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders embrace written procedures and policies</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders prefer stability and order within the organization</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders discourage innovation</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making is made by the leaders alone without involving employees</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders prefer formality in reporting</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are promoted based on the ability to conform to the rules of the office</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 Correlation Analysis

A pearson correlation analysis was done to determine the relationship between To determine the effect of autocratic leadership style, transactional leadership style, intellectual stimulation and bureaucratic leadership style affect organizational development. The study revealed that there was a positive and significant correlation between organization development and autocratic leadership (r=0.374, p=0.001), transactional leadership (r=0.40, p=0.727), intellectual simulation (r=0.728, p=0.000), and bureaucratic leadership (r=0.580, p=0.000).
Table 4.6: Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>OD</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>BL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Development (OD)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Leadership (AL)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Leadership (TL)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Simulation (IS)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Leadership (BL)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.728**</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.580**</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

4.9 Regression Analysis

4.9.1 Regression Analysis of Autocratic Leadership and Organization Development

A regression analysis was done between autocratic leadership and organization development as shown in table 4.7. On analysis, the R square value was 0.140 and a p-value of (0.001) was considered significant. Therefore, implied that 14% of the variation in organization development was caused by variables of autocratic leadership while 86% were caused by other factors not considered in this study.

Table 4.7: Model Summary of Autocratic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.374a</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), autocratic leadership
Table 4.8: Anova Analysis of Autocratic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>12.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.758</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.369</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: organization development  
b. Predictors: (Constant), autocratic leadership

The Anova analysis between autocratic leadership and organization development revealed that the F value 12.696 was significant (0.001) this implies that there was a linear relationship between autocratic leadership and organization development as indicated in Table 4.8

Table 4.9: Coefficient of Autocratic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>autocratic</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression equation illustrated in Table 4.9 established that taking autocratic leadership and all other factors held constant organization development increased by 2.686. The findings presented also showed that with all other variables held at zero, a unit change in autocratic leadership would lead to a 0.184 increase in organizational development.

4.9.2 Regression Analysis of Transactional Leadership and Organization Development

A regression analysis was done between transactional leadership and organization development as shown in table 4.10. On analysis, the R square value was 0.002 and a p-value of (0.727) was considered not significant. Therefore, implied that 0.2% of the variation in organization development was caused by variables of transactional leadership while 99.8 % were caused by other factors not considered in this study.
Table 4.10: Model Summary of Transactional Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.040a</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.23650</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), transactional leadership

Table 4.11: Anova Analysis of Transactional Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.727b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4.363</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.369</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: organization development
b. Predictors: (Constant), transactional leadership

The Anova analysis between transactional leadership and organization development revealed that the F value .123 was not significant (0.727) this implies that there was a no linear relationship between transactional leadership and organization development as indicated in Table 4.11

4.9.3 Regression Analysis of Intellectual Stimulation and Organization Development

A regression analysis was done between intellectual stimulation and organization development as shown in table 4.12. On analysis, the R square value was 0.529 and a p-value of (0.000) was considered significant. Therefore, implied that 52.9% of the variation in organization development was caused by variables of intellectual stimulation while 47.1 % were caused by other factors not considered in this study.

Table 4.12: Model Summary of Intellectual Stimulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.728a</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.16236</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>87.756</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual stimulation
Table 4.13: Anova Analysis of Intellectual Stimulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.313</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.313</td>
<td>87.756</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.369</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: organization development
b. Predictors: (Constant), Intellectual Stimulation

The Anova analysis between intellectual stimulation and organization development revealed that the F value 87.756 was significant (0.000) this implies that there was a linear relationship between intellectual stimulation and organization development as indicated in Table 4.13

Table 4.14: Coefficient of Intellectual Stimulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.402</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intellectual simulation</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression equation illustrated in Table 4.14 established that taking intellectual stimulation into account and all other factors held constant organization development increased by 2.402 The findings presented also showed that with all other variables held at zero, a unit change in intellectual stimulation would lead to a 0.288 increase in organizational development.

4.9.4 Regression Analysis of Bureaucratic Leadership and Organization Development

A regression analysis was done between bureaucratic leadership and organization development as shown in Table 4.15. On analysis, the R square value was 0.336 and a p-value of (0.000) was considered significant. Therefore, implied that 33.6% of the variation in organization development was caused by variables of bureaucratic leadership while 66.4 % were caused by other factors not considered in this study.
Table 4.15: Model Summary of Bureaucratic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.580a</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.19280</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>39.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Bureaucratic leadership

Table 4.16: Anova Analysis of Bureaucratic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>39.547</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.899</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.369</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: organization development
b. Predictors: (Constant), Bureaucratic leadership

The Anova analysis between bureaucratic leadership and organization development revealed that the F value 39.547 was significant (.000) this implies that there was a linear relationship between bureaucratic leadership and organization development as indicated in Table 4.16

Table 4.17: Coefficient of Bureaucratic Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression equation illustrated in Table 4.17 established that taking bureaucratic leadership and all other factors held constant organization development increased by 2.526. The findings presented also showed that with all other variables held at zero, a unit change in bureaucratic leadership would lead to a 0.247 increase in organizational development.
4.10 Chapter Summary
This chapter has highlighted results and findings. The first section provided an analysis of demographic data of the respondents, the second section dealt with data on autocratic leadership the third section reviewed data on transactional leadership, and the fourth section covered issues of intellectual stimulation while the last section looked at data on bureaucratic leadership. In chapter five this results are discussed and relevant conclusions and recommendations made with regard to organization development at Uchumi supermarket.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This section gives summary of findings, discussions, conclusion, recommendation and suggestions for further study. The discussion are done based on the four research questions under study.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The general objective of this study was to determine the impact of Leadership Styles on organizational development in Uchumi Supermarket. The following objectives guided the study: To determine the effect of autocratic leadership style on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket: To determine the effect of transactional leadership style on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket: To determine the effect of intellectual stimulation on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket: To determine the effect of bureaucratic leadership style on organizational development at Uchumi Supermarket.

This study used descriptive survey design as its selected research design. Descriptive survey was chosen by the researcher since it supports the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data without influencing the environment on which the study was conducted. The population of this study was 122 employees combining senior managers and middle level managers that work in Uchumi Supermarket in Nairobi. This study used stratified and simple random sampling in ensuring that all the middle level managers from various departments are well represented in selecting the respondents of the study. Based on the Yemen’s Formula, the sample size of the study has been determined. The sample size of this study is 93 respondents. This study utilized a structure closed ended questionnaire based on Likert Scale of five measurement levels that is Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree.

From the first objective the study established that respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the leader fully seeks input from employees, it was however agreed that leaders almost make all of the decisions, the study also revealed that the group heads dictate all the work methods and processes. There was uncertainty of whether employees are rarely trusted with decisions that are regarded important and crucial, nor work being structured
and very rigid. It was agreed that rules are important and tend to be clearly outlined and communicated. Respondents however failed to confirm whether creativity from the employees tend to be discouraged.

From the second objective it was established that most respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the leader gives a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project, leaders discourage independent thinking, leaders reward performance based on specific goals and targets set, and leaders are focused on maintaining the status quo within the entire organization. It was however agreed by a majority that leaders almost make all of the decisions, majority agreed that leaders like to micromanage. The findings also show that leaders discourage new ways of doing things within the firm (change) and leaders appeal to the self-interest of employees.

Based on the third objectives, the finding indicated that majority agreed that the leaders suggest new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals, it was also agreed that leaders highlight positive outcomes. There was however uncertainty about leaders allowing employees to look at issues from various angles, the leader allows different perspectives when solving problems, the leader encourages teamwork among employees, leaders encourage innovation and creativity. It was however disagreed that leaders create a conducive environment to support creation and sharing of knowledge.

The findings from the fourth objective established that the leaders prefer formality in reporting, in addition, decision making is made by the leaders alone without involving employees. There was however uncertainty over leaders preferring stability and order within the organization. At the same time majority disagreed that leaders embrace written procedures and policies nor leaders discourage innovation. It was also disagreed that employees are promoted based on the ability to conform to the rules of the office.

**5.3 Discussions**

**5.3.1 Effect of Autocratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development**

The study established that respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the leader fully seeks input from employees. According to Shah (2016) in his study of impromptu leadership influenced by a collaborative search, he defines an autocratic leader as the one who is very conscious of his position and has little trust or faith in the subordinates, he feels that pay is just a reward for work and it is only the reward, which can motivate. In
another word, they are the type of leaders who have the tendencies of commanding and expect compliance. For that result, all the decision pertaining to the running of the organizations depends on them and no suggestions of initiatives are entertained from the subordinate.

It was also agreed that leaders almost make all of the decisions. Other studies have revealed that Autocratic management are trustworthy where they want the subordinate to take instructions as they say. In addition, that line of reasoning, these leaders have no occurrence it in leadership since they remain appointed to the leadership position or responsibility bestowed that involves managing people (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). The rights for making decisions remain retained by the autocratic leaders. The ideology of autocratic type of leadership has the capability of harming and destroying an institution with a negative repercussion as they coerce the employees to accomplish tasks and objectives in a very shallow way, build upon personalized objectives (Gachingirí, 2015).

The study also revealed that the group heads dictate all the work methods and processes. Amagoh (2009) concurs that business owner’s use autocratic leadership to ensure all employees are on the same page with the business owner. Autocratic work environments usually have little room for flexibility. Business owners use this management style to ensure all goods or services remain produced in a consistent manner. As a result, the leaders tend to develop more complex but smart goals and objectives of the organization so that the organization is capable of achieving its vision according to their core values, mission, and millennium goals (Amagoh, 2009).

There was uncertainty of whether employees are rarely trusted with decisions that are regarded important and crucial. Leadership styles affect in totality the strategy execution of the organization. As is with any organization, the leadership of the organization possesses a complex relationship with the employees of the organization. The relationship between the leadership of the organization and the employees of the organization largely depends on the style of leadership engaged upon the organization. In the words of Validova and Pulaj (2018), autocratic leadership styles breeds about a poor relationship between the leadership/management of the organization and the employees of the organization. This is largely attributable to the fact that there exists no consultation
between the leadership thus the development of the strategy and executors of the strategy who are the employees (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011).

A regression analysis was done between autocratic leadership and organization development and the results show that 14% of the variation in organization development was caused by variables of autocratic leadership. According to Arif (2016) business owners and shareholders employ an autocratic leadership style to ensure they have full control of their business. Autocratic leadership does not rely on several people to make a decision in urgent business situations. Business owners can assess the company under current economic decisions to make critical business decisions (Voyer & McIntosh, 2013). Other businesses in the economic environment may prefer professional relationships with a worker directly with the business owner. Business owners usually become the face of an organization in an autocratic leadership environment. Since this type of leadership encompasses zero involvement of the individuals in decision-making, big business employs this type of management since they are capable of controlling all activities in the organization (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). As a result, the type of leadership is a vital aspect that plays a significant role in the achievement of the organizational vision.

5.3.2 Effect of Transactional Leadership Style on Organizational Development

The study established that most respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the leader gives a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project. According to Allio (2012) transactional leaders elucidate for their clique the followers' responsibilities, the expectations the leaders have, the tasks that must remain accomplished and the benefits to the self-interests of the followers for compliance. Transactional leaders usually operate within the boundaries of the existing system, emphasize process rather than substance as means of control and are successful in stable and predictable environments (Brown & May, 2012). The primary factors of transactional leadership model include contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire (Brown & May, 2012).

The study established that leaders reward performance based on specific goals and targets set. Transactional leaders expect their followers to have attributes such as commitment to goals, the expectancy of goal attainment, the expectancy of rewards and need for role clarity. In order to achieve the highest subordinate performance, these leaders use rewards and punishments as tools (Gachingiri, 2015). In any recital breakdown, transactional
leaders tends to play a significant role to lack of objectives and opportunity of a remuneration from the side of the follower and therefore they respond with goal setting, instruction, and training, work assignment and reward or punishment.

It was revealed that leaders are focused on maintaining the status quo within the entire organization. Contingent reward provides rewards for effort and recognizes good performance. Management by exception maintains the status quo, intervenes when subordinates do not meet acceptable performance levels and initiates corrective action to improve performance. The transactional style of leadership was first described by Max Weber in 1947 and then by Bernard Bass in 1981. The managers most often use this style. It focuses on the basic management process of controlling, organizing, and short-term planning (Amagoh, 2009).

It was agreed by a majority that leaders almost make all of the decisions. Transactional leadership is like bureaucrats leadership. It is a sense of power and controls direct orders. Transactional leadership makes clear that what is required and expected from their subordinates. It also mentions that subordinates will get an award if they follow the orders seriously. Dexter (2007) asserts that sometimes punishments remain not mentioned but they remain to understand. In the early stages of transactional leadership, the subordinate is in the process of negotiating the contract. The contract specifies fixed salary and the benefits that will remain given to the subordinate. Rewards remain given to subordinates for applied effort. Some organization use incentives to encourage their subordinates for greater productivity. Transactional leadership is a way of increasing the performance of its subordinates by giving those rewards (Gachingiri, 2015).

The findings also show that leaders discourage new ways of doing things within the firm (change) and leaders appeal to the self-interest of employees. Transactional leadership has more of a ‘telling style’. Transactional leadership is because reward or punishment is dependent on the performance (Ehigie & Akpan, 2014). Even though researchers have highlighted its limitations, transactional leadership remains used by many employers. According to Kihara (2016) more and more companies are adopting transactional leadership to increase the performance of its employees. This approach is prevalent in the real workplace. Transactional leadership, when the leader assigns work to its subordinates, then it is the responsibility of the subordinate to see that the assigned task is finished on time. His work also shows that if the assigned task remains not completed on
time or if something then punishment remain given for their failure. Nevertheless, if they accomplish the task in time then the subordinates remain given a reward for successfully completing the task. Subordinates are also given an award and praised for exceeding expectations. A subordinate whose performance is below expectation remain punished and some action maintain taken to increase his or her performance (Michael, 2013).

5.3.3 Effect of Intellectual Stimulation on Organizational Development

Based on the finding majority agreed that the leaders suggests new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals. Sandvik and Selart (2018) indicate that intellectual Stimulation is the concept that involves the encouragement of the leaders in the organization to embrace the ideology of creativity and innovation with an aim of using the same system to achieve the organizational goals and objectives. This ideology is vital in the business platforms because this concept attempts to arouse the notion of creative thinking an aspect that is seeing most of the current organization to remain ranked as the most superior organizations (Amagoh, 2009). In addition, intellectual stimulation attempts to offer the importance in the line of arousing followers' thoughts and imagination, as well as stimulating their ability to identify and solve problems creatively (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011).

It was also agreed that leaders highlight positive outcomes. For that point of view, intellectual stimulation remains demonstrated when leaders attempt to encourage their employees to be creative and innovative and they are also going down to try the new approach and challenges their own beliefs and values (Taormina, 2008). Importantly, this ideology tends to promote problem solving by finding out the creative solution. Intellectual stimulation is an attribute of transformational leaders who build up capability followers, motivate creative thinking to generate innovative ideas, and teach how to think about a variety of things with a new alternative. The transformational form of leaders forever and a day hearten internal learning climate through the provision of necessary requirements (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2015).

There was however uncertainty about leaders allowing employees to look at issues from various angles. Alonderiene and Majauskaite (2016) notes that intellectual stimulation, followers maintain challenged to find new ways of doing their job. The followers remain challenged with the question, whether they are in line with the goals of the organization in general. Intellectual stimulation will amplify the aptitude of subordinates to comprehend
and solve the problems; they are also thought infuriating and imaginative exercise, including changes in values and beliefs (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016).

It was disagreed that leaders create a conducive environment to support creation and sharing of knowledge. According to Amagoh (2009) Knowledge sharing through intellectual stimulation is a vital activity in an organization since it will promote a new way of dealing with problems of organizations. Again, since knowledge sharing seems to remain supported by diverse leadership style, it remains viewed as an important resource of an organization. Comprehension division among workforce will augment rapid rejoinder to customer needs at a lower cost in operation (Lok & Crawford, 2009). The face-to-face interface in the process of knowledge sharing remains done between individuals within an organization to share experiences and knowledge to obtain new knowledge, core competencies, problem-solving skills, learn new techniques, and starting new situation (Kihara, 2016).

A regression analysis was done between intellectual stimulation and organization development. On analysis it was established that 52.9% of the variation in organization development was caused by variables of intellectual stimulation. Knowledge Sharing is an essential part of acquaintance management (Sandvik & Selart, 2018). Knowledge sharing remains defined as a series of actions taken by workers in disseminating applicable information to other employees within the company. In another word, knowledge sharing is as a cultural social interaction through knowledge change actives, skill, and experience of employees in all departments of the organization (Peet, 2012). The type of leadership that remains exploited in an organization is one of the essential factors that affect organizational knowledge sharing activities. Diverse studies have found out the importance of top management support on the same ideology. In essence, knowledge sharing process will be effective if supported by transformational leadership styles through intellectual stimulation (Adenyi, 2016).

5.3.4 Effect of Bureaucratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development

The findings established that the leaders prefer formality in reporting. Bureaucracy relies upon the division of labor in the aspect that each individual is tasked with a certain type of work or responsibility and he or she is expected to implement the task as it is required (Peet, 2012). Bureaucracy always has everyone with a defined role in the organization and that the roles are distinct from each other. In this aspect everyone performs clearly
defined roles and that the roles are rarely overlapping each other (Brown & May, 2012). Bureaucracy in the sense requires some form of sternness whereby the rules and roles are enforced onto an individual by the person in the senior position to the person in the junior position (Adenyi, 2016).

In addition, decision making is made by the leaders alone without involving employees. This style of leadership is common in all public sector organization whereby each person employed seem to have a fixed kind of duty and he or she is expected to act as instructed to bring out the common good of the organization (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). The order emanates from the top duty officials and passed down through various channels to the subordinate officials of the organization. The communication hierarchy from the subordinate members of the organization to the superordinate members of the organization is also in such hierarchy as the communication is passed from one official to another in their superiority up to the top management of the organization (Amagoh, 2009).

There was however uncertainty over leaders preferring stability and order within the organization. In bureaucratic leadership, the role in the hierarchical position is based on position (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). An individual’s role in the organization is dependent upon the position he or she holds in the organization. If the individual is in a superior position, he or she expects subordination from the persons who are below them in the hierarchy of leadership and often the loyalty of the subordinates is also expected (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014).

At the same time majority disagreed that leaders embrace written procedures and policies nor leaders discourage innovation. The process of formalization works to regulate the workforce in the organization and increasing the awareness of the description of the job required of the workers of the organization, the managements works to achieve overall efficiency in the different fields of operation (Chapman, Johnson, & Kilner, 2014). Tasks thus are able to be met with ease as different members of the organization are aware of what is required from him or her in the organization (Amagoh, 2009). Top in the setbacks of the organization is the effect of formalization to inhibit innovation by the employees of the organization. Formalization is such that the organization defines roles for each and every individual and fixes them to the rules and expects results from them (Taormina, 2008).
A regression analysis was done between bureaucratic leadership and organization development the results that 33.6% of the variation in organization development was caused by variables of bureaucratic leadership. Numerous studies have been undertaken to establish the impact of centralization in the organization (Brauckmann & Pashiardis, 2011). Some have argued that centralization is of major benefit to the organization whereas others argue that centralization has adverse effects to the organization. The positive impact of centralization is that decision making is limited to only a few who know on the workings of the organization (Adenyi, 2016). In the research by Kaparou and Bush (2015) centralization does not require so many consultations in order to form a decision but requires just a few who are at the position of leadership to formulate the decision and enforce the decision on the subjects.

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Effect of Autocratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development
The leaders at Uchumi supermarkets have not fully sought input from employees as a results the leaders make all of the decisions. Similarly, there seem to be issues of trust between the management and employees, this has resulted into employees rarely being entrusted with decisions that are regarded important and crucial. Despite this, the rules are important and tend to be clearly outlined and communicated.

5.4.2 Effect of Transactional Leadership Style on Organizational Development
Leaders have failed to gives a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project, thus implying that they discourage independent thinking. As a result the leaders make almost make all of the decisions and micromanage the enterprise. This notion has resulted into leaders discouraging new ways of doing things within the firm nor appealing to the self-interest of employees.

5.4.3 Effect of Intellectual Stimulation on Organizational Development
At Uchumi, leaders suggests new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals and the leaders highlight positive outcomes. Leaders have however failed to allow employees to look at issues from various angles, there is uncertainty of the leader allowing different perspectives when solving problems, nor encouraging teamwork among employees. Employees are also not certain of the leaders encouraging innovation and creativity.
5.4.4 Effect of Bureaucratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development

Leaders prefer formality in reporting, in addition, decision making is made by the leaders alone without involving employees. The leaders have failed to embrace written procedures and policies and leaders discourage innovation. It was also disagreed that employees are promoted based on the ability to conform to the rules of the office.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Effect of Autocratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development

There is a need for the leaders fully seeks input from employees and at the same time make all of the decisions. It should be upon the leaders to trust particular employees with decisions that are regarded important and crucial. Rules are important and all employees should be made aware. The service industry is dynamic, therefore creativity from the employees should be highly encouraged.

5.5.1.2 Effect of Transactional Leadership Style on Organizational Development

In order to motivate employees, it is of essence that leaders should gives a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project. In addition, the reward performance should be based on specific goals and targets set. As far as the final decision falls on the leader, participation from employees should be encouraged. The findings also show that leaders discourage new ways of doing things within the firm (change) and leaders appeal to the self-interest of employees.

5.5.1.3 Effect of Intellectual Stimulation on Organizational Development

It is advisable that the leaders need to suggest new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals. In order to motivate employees to perform, they should strive to highlight positive outcomes. In addition, the leaders should allow employees to look at issues from various angles in order be able to solve problems as well as encourages teamwork among employees, Innovation and creativity should be encouraged as this offers a conducive environment to support creation and sharing of knowledge.
5.5.1.4 Effect of Bureaucratic Leadership Style on Organizational Development
Formality in reporting should be highly encouraged however when it comes to decision makin, leaders need to involve all employees. Use of written procedures and policies shoud be encouraged and employees should be promoted based on the performance.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies
The current study studied the impact of leadership Styles on organizational development in Uchumi Supermarket. Similar study should be done to determine other factors that affects organizational development in the firm. In addition, there is a need to do a similar study in other supermarkets in order to be able to generalize the findings.
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APPENDIX 1: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION I: Demographic Information

Kindly respond to the questions below by ticking in the appropriate boxes.

1. Name (optional) __________________________________

2. What is your gender?

   Male    
   Female  

3. What is your age?

   18- 30 yrs.  
   31- 40 yrs.  
   41- 50 yrs.  
   51- 60 yrs.  
   Over 61 yrs.  

4. What department do you work in?

   Finance  
   Customer Service  
   Marketing  
   Sales  
   Operations  
   IT Department  
   Other (specify) _____________________________

5. What are your years of work at Uchumi Supermarket?

   1-3  4-6  7-9  10-12  13-15  
   years  years  years  years  years
SECTION II: Autocratic Leadership Style and Organizational Development

Kindly answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge based on the Likert Scale.

Strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, neutral = 3, Agree = 4, strongly agree = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The leader fully seeks input from employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Leaders almost make all of the decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The group heads dictate all the work methods and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Employees are rarely trusted with decisions that are regarded important and crucial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Work tends to be structured and very rigid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Rules are important and tend to be clearly outlined and communicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Creativity from the employees tends to be discouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION III: Transactional Leadership Style and Organizational Development

Kindly answer the following questions using the Likert scale provided in section II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The leader gives a clear reward scheme for each completed task in the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Leaders almost make all of the decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Leaders discourage independent thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Leaders discourage new ways of doing things within the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Leaders reward performance based on specific goals and targets set

18. Leaders are focused on maintaining the status quo within the entire organization

19. Leaders like to micromanage

20. Leaders appeal to the self-interest of employees

SECTION IV: Intellectual Stimulation and Organizational Development

Kindly answer the following questions using the Likert scale provided in section II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The leader allows employees to look at issues from various angles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The suggests new ways of looking at how to meet the set targets and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The leader allows different perspectives when solving problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The leader encourages teamwork among employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Leaders highlight positive outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Leaders encourage innovation and creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Leaders create a conducive environment to support creation and sharing of knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION V: Bureaucratic Leadership Style and Organizational Development

Kindly answer the following questions using the Likert scale provided in section II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>The leaders have created a well-defined dominance hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Leaders embrace written procedures and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Leaders prefer stability and order within the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Leaders discourage innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Decision making is made by the leaders alone without involving employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Leaders prefer formality in reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Employees are promoted based on the ability to conform to the rules of the office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation.