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Abstract
This study is a modest attempt to empirically examine the relationship between leadership ethics and performance (proxied by productivity, motivation and job satisfaction) at Dangote Cement Company Plc., Gboko. The survey research design was adopted for the study. A sample size of 317 employees was drawn from the total population of 1523 employees. Descriptive statistics such as simple percentages and tables were used to analyse the responses to the 253 returned questionnaires. Furthermore, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was adopted by the researcher to test the study’s formulated hypotheses at 5% level of significance for a two tailed test. Findings from the study revealed that: There is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and productivity, employee’s motivation and job satisfaction at Dangote Cement Company Plc., Gboko. The study therefore recommends amongst others the need for managers of private organizations to adhere strictly to standard ethics and direct motivation to meet employees’ needs in order to enhance better performance, efficiency and high productivity in an organization’s service, thereby facilitating overall service delivery and national development.
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INTRODUCTION
Leadership is considered a major factor that has an indisputable influence on employee performance in any kind of organization (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000). But how employees perform under different kinds of leadership has been a point of contention among researchers and scholar alike (Gadot, 2006). Similarly, Studies have shown that employees’ performance usually increases under extroverted leaders when such employees are passive, but decreases if such employees are proactive (Grant, Fried, Parker, & Frese, 2011). Accordingly, leadership has immense influence on employees’ performance and as such, must conform to transparent acceptable standards to positively impact on employees’ performance since all organizations desire Better and improvement performance from their employees’. However the realization of this is farfetched since leadership continually throbs in rising challenges of scandals and unethical behaviours.

According to Alam, Hashim & Siraj (2010), public leadership must be guided by actions and decisions that will ensure the sustainability of delivering quality services from public institutions. Dorasamy (2010) asserts that the credibility of public institutions can easily be eroded due to the absence of the leadership adhering to acceptable standards. Judge & Piccolo (2004) attests that, such disregard do arises because most leaders do not
subject their roles to ethical justification. However in today’s corporate world, the necessity of building corporate ethical values which are deeply rooted in the values and vision of humanity cannot be over emphasized. And to this, Gardner (1993) asserts that, the resources from which we can extract our vision to transform ethical leadership now and in the near future is from humanity’s morality.

Accordingly, sound morality enhances responsible leaders to express in their daily conversations, dealings and transactions, judgments and decisions, as well as decorum in meetings, acceptable high ethics and morality in order to enhance efficient and effective leadership as well as becoming a mirror for the followers. However, morality can only be a strong leadership weapon if it is hinged on sound ethical footings. Similarly, Spiritual people, scholars and the theorists from the past have been stressing upon the substantial effect of ethics for leaders and followers in order to control the supremacy in an organization.

Although, ethics for long has been a burning question for the world, it is still hot cake to be explored by researchers and the business society. However, one apparent reason for the augmented awareness in the field of ethics is the ethical violations and humiliations discovered in modern corporate organizations (Manz, Baker & Hunt, 2008; Revell & Rutherfoord; Trevino & Brown, 2004).

It is however worthy to note that in today’s world, there are leaders, called “lethal leaders” who constantly search out for the loopholes in the administration system, and use them for their personal benefit at the cost and detriment of the organization and its workers (Padilla et al., 2007; Schaubroeck, Chen, Lin, Chen & Chung, 2007).

Trevino and Brown (2004) suggested that unethical behaviour has been in existence since the beginning of humanity, and in this modern era, people are more ethical than before in yearning for transparency and fairness in all business transactions and culture within and outside the organization but the complexities of modern organizations and the competing business environment has led to the violation of moral and ethical values by leaders in trying to achieve targets and thrive on despite competition which give rise to ethical challenges and threats.

Though, the ethical and unethical leaders have ever been there since the evolution of humanity, their behavior in modern times is becoming the most crucial factor for the organization’s development and success due to the mounting intricacies and challenges most modern organizations face. Similarly, in keeping pace with the desired swelling quantity of production or services needed and to be offered, the rapid pace of information flood and huge performance pressure raises the chances of honesty or dishonesty in perception and ethical decision making by leaders.

Limited studies have been conducted on the consequences of ethical and unethical leadership on employee performance (Kalshoven, Den Hartog & De Hoogh, 2011). Though some researchers (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2005) have attempted to explore the concept of ethical leadership and its impact on employee conduct, empirical studies in management largely ignore ethical leadership and yet employee performance is greatly affected by either the ethical or unethical behaviours of those who lead them. Against this backdrop, this present study addresses the problem by studying the impact of leadership ethics on employee’s organizational performance in Nigeria with particular emphasis to Dangote Cement Company Plc., Gboko.
Accordingly, the main objective of this study is to investigate the extent to which leadership ethics impacts on employee’s organizational performance and the specific objectives are:

1. To examine the relationship between leadership ethics and employees’ productivity of Dangote Cement Company, Gboko.

2. To examine the relationship between leadership ethics and employees’ motivation at Dangote Cement Company, Gboko.

3. To examine the relationship between leadership ethics and employees’ job satisfaction at Dangote Cement Company, Gboko.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Conceptual Framework:

Concept of Ethics

The word “ethics” which has its origin from the Greeks is traditionally referred to as the rules of conduct. It also refers to moral philosophy, which is the discipline of critical analysis of the meaning and justification of moral beliefs. Ethics is essentially normative, that is, it prescribes human behaviour as obligatory, prohibitive, or permissible. However, there is considerable overlap between ethics and law, and ethics and etiquette. Accordingly, much of law embodies ethical principles, such as: respect of basic rights to life, property, etc. and it is usually unethical to break the law. A breach of etiquette can also be unethical if it is done intentionally to offend someone, simply for one’s own amusement (Perry, 2000). Similarly, moral principles state how human beings ought to relate and treat one another and as such (moral claims) cannot be proved or disproved by empirical means alone.

Ethics concerns itself with right and wrong; good and bad; duty and obligation and moral responsibility. Certain behaviour or actions are generally considered as morally wrong and ought not to be done by anybody in the society (Oluya, 1998). He gave examples of such forms of behaviour as: armed robbery, murder, dishonesty, corruption, etc. and equally described some behaviour as morally good and acceptable by all in the society, mentioning some as: honesty, kindness, respect for life, self-discipline, patriotism, etc.

However, the questions that readily come to one’s mind are: why do we consider certain actions and behaviours’ as good and others as bad? What do we even mean when we say certain action and behaviour is bad? Is it appropriate for an individual to consider some actions as bad and some as good judging by himself? Is it true that there is nothing good or bad but thinking makes it so as others claim? Or can certain things be good or bad irrespective of our thinking? What are the fundamental principles of morality and how do we know them. These and similar questions are what ethics deals with and this brings us to the question of what then is Ethics?

Ethics, according to (Oluya, 1998) is ‘the science of morality which examines the nature of moral values and judgement of human conducts’, stating that ethics is a normative science that studies the norms of human behaviour. Generally, ethics is a system of moral principles or rules of behaviour that controls, influences or regulates a person’s behaviour.

Ethics, in essence, does not concern itself with the description of the ways things are but the way things ought to be. It deals with norms or standard of human behaviour.
The aim of ethics is not to describe the way people do behave in practice, but to state the way that people ought to behave. It is the norms of conduct to which human actions ought to conform. Essentially, the major function of ethics is to regulate the behaviour of public servants to act according to the dictates and guidelines of their profession to achieve efficiency and increase performance.

**Concept of Leadership**

In a recent survey of theory and practice in leadership, Northouse (2004) concluded that “there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are people who have tried to define it”, but Northouse’s definition will be used here, and he accordingly defined Leadership as “a process by which an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve common goals”.

Let’s note at this early stage that the term followers will be used to describe those whom the leader attempts to influence considering the fact that, the term subordinates is often used in organizational settings, but the term followers suggests that leaders can be in any role or position, and a bureaucratic hierarchy is not necessarily implied.

Additionally, the concept of shared leadership contradicts the notion of “solo” or unilateral leadership. According to Gill (2006), shared leadership is characterized by the quality of interactions rather than hierarchical level; team problem solving; “conversation rather than instructions, shared values, and beliefs”; and “honesty and a desire for the common good”. Another useful way of framing leadership is to contrast it with management, which according to Kotter & Heskett (1990), produces predictability, order, and consistency regarding key results which include planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving.

On the other hand, Leadership produces changes and this includes establishing direction through visioning, aligning people with the vision and strategies, and motivating and inspiring staff. However, when management and leadership are combined, it becomes administration which makes Roberts-DeGennaro & Packard, (2002) defines administration as a combination of leadership and management. Leadership includes visioning, change management, strategy development, organization design, culture management, and community collaboration. Management includes program design, financial management, information systems, human resource management, program evaluation, and project management.

To this end therefore, the Effective execution of management functions often requires leadership. Leadership is often seen as a key factor in coordinating and aligning organizational processes for success as it relates to any aspect of organizational functioning, since it focuses on organizational performance, and most importantly, effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes. (Lewis, Packard, & Lewis, 2007).

**Concept of Ethical Leadership**

The term “leadership” has been variously defined. Nelson (2006) defines it as steps, procedures or process that direct and guide the behavior of people in their work environment. To Armstrong (2003), leadership is simply the ability to persuade others to willingly behave differently to achieving the task set for them with the help of the group. Northouse (2010) sees it as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. Kodish (2006) argues that, for leaders to demonstrate high quality leadership, they must be strong in their ethical behaviours.
However, Oates and Dalmau (2013) concluded that ethical leadership is about doing what is right for the long term benefits of all stakeholders and went ahead to say that ethical leadership is about balancing the organization’s short term goals and longer term aspirations in a way that achieve positive results for all those who could be affected by the organization and the decisions of its leaders.

Brown et al. (2005) suggested that the combination of integrity, ethical standards, and fair treatment of employees are the cornerstones of ethical leadership. They define ethical leadership as the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision making. This definition implies that a leader should be both a moral person and a moral manager. It further shows that while demonstrating moral management behaviour, ethical leaders do not compromise ethical standards in pursuit of short term, bottom-line, organizational performance.

Treviño & Brown (2004) proposed that ethical leadership, in its true sense, promotes ethical conduct by practicing as well as managing ethics and holding everyone accountable for it. They describe ethical leaders as persons exhibiting traits that are consistent with normative ethical principles such as honesty, fairness and trustworthiness. These leaders make fair and balanced decisions, and actively consider the appropriateness of those decisions in terms of their ethical consequences. They incorporate moral principles in their beliefs, values and behaviours, and have strong ethical norms and values. They also have supporting character for themselves and others which are intensely surrounded by a broad vision. Ladkin (2008) found that ethical leadership engages in recreation of the ethical aspects of a leader’s efforts to fit well with the full awareness of the human atmosphere. He further asserts that, ethical leadership has three main attributes which are: “visionary” in recognizing itself and the situation, “consistency” that is, similarity among itself and others in ideals and communications, and “rationality” in achievement of goals.

Similarly, Kanungo (2001) mention that ethical leaders behave in a manner associated with the wellbeing of others. This means ethical leaders are truthful, fair in their decisions, and good at communication with their followers. Ethical leaders always set clear ethical standards and use appropriate rewards as well as punishments to implement those standards (Khuong and Nhu, 2015). Given the ephemeral now, and due to the ubiquitous concerns about such matters as organizational scandals, the promotion of ethical leadership is of much critical concern (Bourg, 2007).

**Concept of Employee performance**

Performance is a multidimensional construct and an extremely vital criterion that determines organizational successes or failures. Prasetya & Kato (2011) define performance as the attained outcomes of actions with skills of employees who perform in some situation. According to Pattanayak (2005), the performance of an employee is his resultant behaviour on a task which can be observed and evaluated. To him, employee performance is the contribution made by an individual in the accomplishment of organizational goals. Here employee performance is simply the result of patterns of action carried out to satisfy an objective according to some standards. This means that, employee performance is a behaviour which consists of directly observable actions of an employee,
and also mental actions or products such as answers or decisions, which result in organizational outcomes in the form of attainment of goals.

**Productivity**

Tangen writing in (2005) saw productivity as a multidimensional term. He arrived at a conclusion due to the availability of both verbal and mathematical definitions of the term. To him, whereas the mathematical definition was more a means of measuring performance, the verbal definition seeks to explain the meaning of the concept of productivity. He cited fourteen (14) references each with a different definition of productivity pointing out that the definitions depend on the context within which they are placed.

Notwithstanding the differences of these definitions, the basic context seems to be the same. This, According to Tangen (2005), was a conclusion arrived at by Broman (2004). He further cited Ghobadian & Husband (1990) who suggested that there are three broad categories within these similar definitions, which are:

i. The Technological Concept; which dwells on the relationship between the ratios of output to the inputs used in its production,

ii. The Engineering Concept; which dwells on the relationship between the actual and the potential output of a process, and finally,

iii. The Economist Concept which dwells on the efficiency of resource allocation.

When Giusti & Wrolstad (2001) cited by Tangen, define productivity as “…the ability to satisfy the market’s needs for goods and services with a minimum of total resource consumption”. They confirmed Ghobadian and Husband’s (1990) assertion of there being three main categories of the definitions and firmly placed their definition under the economist concept. The efficiency of resource allocation is thus clearly captured in their statement of “minimum of total resource consumption”. This definition is thus, best suited for the service industry, especially, the financial sector. Organizational Productivity is a multidimensional factor an organization, and can thus be improved by employee’s efforts (Sotodeh, 2001; Taheri, 2004). But in Dangote Cement Company, employees with fixed salaries need more effective leaders to promote Organizational Productivity, because, people –oriented or task-oriented leadership behaviour may have different effects on productivity since Productivity is the outcome of the leaders’ actions with their subordinates.

**Motivation**

According to Watkiss (2004), motivation is the way to driving a person into doing something. Much of these drives are the thoughts of potential rewards, or the consequences of not doing the something. Motivation is that influencing factor or force that makes people do something with the anticipation that their needs will be met or satisfied or their expected desires fulfilled. Motivation therefore inspires the individual to have the desire or willingness to complete his task. Motivation therefore refers to the initiation, direction, intensity and persistence of human behaviour.

Based on Watkiss definition, it can be concluded that motivation is the idea and initiative to encourage and drive the individual to do something or to performance better which can lead to the organization’s better performance to enable it stand competition. According to Ormrod (2003), organizations do not merely exist to survive, but also be
able to stand competition and gain favourable profits. But these can only be achieved through the organizations workforce who are the employees, thus their motivation to achieve better performance is of utmost importance. Motivation therefore, makes the employee have high morale, self-esteem and also feel comfortable with their place of work. Though it might be difficult to argue that a motivated workplace guarantees higher performance and increased revenue, they are however necessary actions that lead to employees’ satisfaction and thereby increase their productivity. According to Ormrod (2003), it can:

- Direct behaviour toward particular goals
- Lead to increased effort and energy
- Enhance cognitive processing
- Determine what consequences are reinforcing
- Lead to improved performance.

**Job satisfaction**

Robbins (2001) defined job satisfaction as a person's general attitude toward work. According to Handoko (2001), it is the emotional state of pleasant or unpleasant by the employees to do their work. Job satisfaction reflects ones feelings on his work. It can be deduced from the employee’s attitude (positive or otherwise) to work and things concerned with his work environment. Job satisfaction is important for self-actualization and, employees who do not achieve this will also not achieve psychological maturity and will eventually become frustrated and as such, job satisfaction is important to the employee as well as the organization.

Newstrom & Davis (1997) definition of job satisfaction is in line with that of Robbins as a set of pleasant feelings or otherwise of an employee towards his job. Normally, when employees joined an organization, they come along with their wants, needs, desires, and past experience that ignites them to form their work's expectations and as a result, an employee Will feel satisfied if he feels that there is match between his expectations and that of the job as benefits provided by such employment.

In other words, job satisfaction is one's attitude toward his work. Job satisfaction reflects a person's general attitude toward work. The attitude that arises is the result of the match between the expectations provided in exchange for work. Thus will be born the attitude of job satisfaction based on rewards that they receive as consideration at the organization where they work and therefore, Someone who has high job satisfaction will have positive attitude towards his work while one who is not satisfied with his work will have negative attitude towards his work.

According to Mary & Supomo (2001), as cited in Heryanto (2011), job satisfaction can be understood through three aspects. First, job satisfaction is a form of worker response to the environmental conditions of employment. Second, job satisfaction is often determined by the results of the work or performance. Third, job satisfaction is associated with the worker’s attitude and is exhibited by each worker. Luthans (1995), also affirms to this. In more details (Smith, 1996) suggested the various dimensions of job satisfaction which were later developed into a model for measuring satisfaction with the variables of; (1) interesting or not the type of work performed by workers, (2) the amount of compensation received by workers, (3) opportunities for promotion, (4) the ability of employers in providing technical assistance and behavioral support, and support colleagues, as a yardstick for measuring or evaluating job satisfaction.
Relationship between ethical leadership and employee performance

Employees are pivotal assets without whom the intended goals of any organization cannot be achieved. According to Mwita (2000), employee performance is the key multi-character factor intended to attain outcomes which has a major connection with planned objectives of the organization. Studies have shown that employee performance can be increased if they are led by ethical leaders (Bello, 2012).

A study by Detert, Treviño, Burris & Andiappan (2007) revealed that, efficient leadership helps employees in discovering and polishing their contributions to the success of the organization. The study also showed that effective leadership is more likely to lead to increase employee performance. Brown & Treviño (2006) found that ethical leadership emphasizes fair treatment, shared values and integrity in common personnel and business transactions. They add that ethical leaders inspire favorable behaviours among employees, encourage high levels of pride and commitment to the organization, and shape the way employees perceive the work content. Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes & Salvador (2009) found positive effects of executive ethical leadership cascade to lower level employees through the ethical leadership practiced by supervisors.

In their study, Brown et al. (2005) showed that ethical leadership positively influences many important employee outcomes. Piccolo, Greenbaum, Den Hartog & Folger, (2010) found a positive relationship between ethical leadership and employee effort. Walumbwa & Schaubroeck (2009) found that perceptions of ethical leadership were related to increased employee voice via their influences on heightened psychological safety. Results of these studies show that ethical leadership favorably influence a significant number of employee outcomes. However, empirical studies on the effects of ethical leadership on employee performance are scanty.

Theoretical Framework

Theories of Ethics

There are basically four (4) schools of ethical thoughts providing explanations for establishment of moral principles. These are:

Empirical Theory: the theory claims that ethics are derived through human experience and are conceived by general agreement.

Rational Theory: This theory claims that it is through reason that people determine what is good or bad and that these determination of logic are independent of experience.

The Intuitive Theory: this theory suggest that ethics are not derived from experience or reason rather people (humans) automatically possess an understanding of what is right or wrong i.e. something similar to natural moral law.

Revelation Theory: this states that God tells man what is right or wrong through such medium as the Bible and the Qur’an.

Leadership Theories and Models

This section summarizes the most influential theories and models of leadership, following the historical development in this field. The earliest research on leadership focused on traits, which were originally seen as innate characteristics of leaders. This area of study has broadened to include skills and competencies as well as more innate traits.
Next, research in group dynamics examined interpersonal and task behaviors as they impacted group effectiveness. The notion of leadership style evolved from this work, often using a continuum from autocratic or directive styles to participative approaches. Eventually, researchers explored the notion that there is no one “best way” of leading and identified contingencies that would suggest the best approach. Current theories commonly include elements of several of these earlier models.

The Trait Approach

Discussions of leadership in the 20th century essentially began with the trait approach. While this perspective is now seen as incomplete, there has been recent renewed interest in characteristics of effective leaders. In spite of the questionable premise of trait theory as originally conceived, recent research has identified some traits associated with effective leaders: intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability (Northouse, 2004). In an extensive review of the trait research, Yukl (2008) found several traits that are related to leadership effectiveness: a high energy level and tolerance for stress, self-confidence (including self-esteem and self-efficacy), an internal locus of control orientation, emotional stability, maturity, and personal integrity. Other factors identified by Yukl included emotional intelligence, including self-awareness, empathy, and self-regulation (the ability to effectively channel emotions and behaviour), and social intelligence, including the ability to understand needs and processes in a situation and behavioral flexibility in adapting to these situational requirements. Systems thinking and the ability to learn are also seen as important.

However, little is known about how a combination of traits may impact effectiveness. Researchers do agree that it is important to note that traits are important only to the extent that they are relevant to a particular leadership situation. In fact, one of the weaknesses of the trait approach is that it does not provide detailed descriptions of how traits affect organizational outcomes (Northouse, 2004).

Regardless of these limitations, Yukl (2008) offered some general suggestions for applications which include; maintaining self-awareness, developing relevant skills through continuous learning and leadership development, remembering that strength can become a weakness in a different situation, and compensating for weaknesses by using delegation or staff with complementary skills.

Leadership Skills and Competencies

The skills approach suggests that leadership abilities can be developed, whereas traits are more inherent in the individual. This approach is most prominent in leadership development programs that focus on identifying specific competencies that are important in a leadership setting. Leadership competencies have been defined as “the combination of knowledge, skills, traits, and attributes that collectively enable someone to perform a given job” (Zenger & Folkman, 2002). The use of competencies in leadership development has become somewhat controversial (Hollenbeck, McCall, & Silzer, 2006). For example, the “competency movement,” as Zenger and Folkman (2002) refer to it, has weaknesses, including, the failure to relate “lists” of competencies to leadership effectiveness in a specific situation and the mistaken assumption that all competencies are equal.

Nevertheless, the competencies perspective is generally seen as one valid piece of leadership development. In their research, Zenger and Folkman (2002) found that 16 groups of competencies were seen as associated with organizational effectiveness. These
included character (displaying integrity and honesty), technical and professional expertise, problem-solving and analytical ability, innovation, self-development, a focus on results, setting “stretch” goals, taking personal responsibility for outcomes, effective communication, inspiring and motivating others, trust and interpersonal effectiveness, concern for others’ development, collaboration and organizational change skills, ability to champion change, and ability to relate well to outside stakeholders.

They also found that leaders with strengths in multiple competencies were most effective, and, significantly, that particular combinations of competencies seemed to be more powerful predictors of effectiveness. For example, being able to give feedback did not always correlate with effectiveness, whereas giving feedback while building trust did. (Zenger & Folkman, 2002). They also found that listening skills alone were not particularly valuable, but listening skills plus other interpersonal skills (e.g., being considerate and caring) did make a difference. Current thinking uses a “strengths perspective,” in which administrators work to build upon their strengths and find situations that optimize them (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001).

Zenger and Folkman (2002) agree that magnifying strengths is the best overall approach, but add that “fatal flaws” must be fixed. For example, they found that an inability to learn from mistakes and a lack of core interpersonal skills were fatal flaws.

Yukl (2006) has noted that different skill mixes are needed at different managerial levels, with conceptual skills more important at higher levels and technical skills more important at lower levels. But some of these skills, like interpersonal skills are needed at all levels, and are equally important at every level of management. In social work, a set of generic management competencies, ranging from advocacy to interpersonal skills, has been developed by the National Network for Social Work Managers (http://www.socialworkmanager.org/); they include many of the competencies mentioned in the research and others that are tailored to human services settings.

Leadership Styles

Competencies are also reflected in the style theories of leadership: the notion that certain behaviors make leaders more effective and that these behaviors or styles (e.g., participative or autocratic leadership) can be learned and improved. The earliest work on this area at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan, contrasted task behaviors, such as directing and providing structure for the group and focusing on production, with relationship behaviour, which emphasized building trust, respect, good relations within the team, and an employee orientation.

Yukl (2006) concluded that “there are serious weaknesses in much of the behavioral research conducted during the past two decades,” noting “a tendency to look for simple answers to complex questions”. Researchers “were looking for a universal theory of leadership that would explain leadership effectiveness in every situation” (Northouse, 2004), but research in this area turned out to be inconclusive, although “the overall pattern of results suggests that effective leaders use a pattern of behavior that is appropriate for the situation and reflects a high concern for task objectives and a high concern for relationships” (Yukl, 2006).

According to the Leadership Grid, the 9,9 management style is seen as the ideal and one toward which managers can and should strive. Survey research has not adequately supported this theory (Yukl, 2006). However, the model is compatible with
other leadership principles and offers useful intuitive guidance, suggesting that any leader or supervisor should be concerned about both people and results. According to contingency theory, however, leaders can use different combinations of task and relationship behaviors, depending on the situation.

**Contingency Theory**

The Contingency theory suggests that there is no one best way to lead and that different behaviors are appropriate in different situations.

**The Decision Approach:** One classic, but complex, contingency model is Vroom & Yetton’s (1973) Decision Model. In this model, the leader considers several variables in a decision tree format, which eventually suggests a style to use. Factors to consider include the importance of the decision, the amount of relevant information that the subordinates and leader have for decision quality, subordinate concern for task goals, the extent of structure in the problem, and the importance that subordinates accept the decision. Based on an assessment of these conditions, the leader uses a style ranging from autocratic to consultative to group decision making. While the model is conceptually incomplete, there is some research support for it (Yukl, 2006).

**Path-Goal Theory:** Another contingency theory, the path-goal model (House & Mitchell, 1974), suggests that the leader assess task and follower characteristics and then demonstrate to followers how working toward organizational goals will meet their needs. Leadership style choices are supportive and directive leadership, discussed above; participative leadership, which involves consultation with subordinates; and achievement-oriented leadership, which involves “setting challenging goals, seeking performance improvements, emphasizing excellence in performance, and showing confidence that subordinates will attain high standards” (Yukl, 2006). For example, to lead followers with high expectations and a need to excel in ambiguous, challenging, and complex situations (common in human services professions), the achievement-oriented approach is suggested (Northouse, 2004). As is the case with several leadership theories, the path-goal model’s complexity makes it difficult for precise implementation and testing (Northouse, 2004), and researches conducted to test it has led to mixed results (Yukl, 2006). However, also consistent with other models, it does offer practice principles that may be useful in particular situations.

**Leader-Member Exchange Theory:** While not explicitly a contingency theory, leader-member exchange (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) is covered here because, like path-goal theory, it places particular emphasis on the relationship between the leader and the follower. In this approach, the leader and individual follower work out an effective relationship of roles and interactions. A favorable relationship is more likely when there is personal compatibility between the leader and follower and the follower is competent and dependable. In such a situation, the leader is supportive, provides mentoring, and uses consultative and delegative styles (Yukl, 2006). In spite of many researches on this theory, there are still conceptual ambiguities that require further research (Yukl, 2006; Northouse, 2004). It however offers useful insight for a leader who wishes to assess and attend to the relationships formed with individual followers so that subordinate needs and organizational goals can be addressed.

**Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Model:** one of the popular contingency theories is situational leadership (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2001). This
model suggests that the effectiveness of leadership styles depends, to a great extent, on the situation. The model is unique in its attention to the variable of follower readiness (a combination of ability and willingness to perform a job) level, which is seen as the most important situational factor. Ability is associated with relevant knowledge and skill, and willingness with confidence and commitment. Readiness is measured in terms of the specific task to be performed (e.g., a given follower might be ready regarding one job duty and not ready in another). Hersey et al. (2001) situational model distinguishes between task behaviour and relationship behaviour on the part of the leader. They contend that varying amounts of relationship and task behaviours can be appropriate, in varying combinations, depending on the readiness level of the follower. According to the situational leadership model, the leader should adapt his or her style to the followers’ readiness. A leader dealing with individuals who are at low readiness in terms of the task in question should use a high degree of structure or task behaviours (such as defining tasks and responsibilities) and a low degree of relationship behaviour (a guiding, telling, or directing approach). As the follower’s maturity level increases, it is appropriate to continue task behaviors and add relationship behaviours, such as two-way communication, facilitation, and emotional support. For followers with moderate readiness, a selling or persuading style is appropriate. As maturity increases further, to a level at which high relationship and low task behaviors are appropriate, an encouraging or participating style is used. When followers have reached a high degree of maturity, the leader can decrease both supportiveness and structure, using a delegating style.

Consistent with other theories, there is little empirical support for the theory, partly because of conceptual weaknesses such as imprecise definitions of its elements and relationships among them (Northouse, 2004, Yukl, 2006). Regardless of these limitations, this model can be helpful to leaders in human service agencies, where followers may vary greatly in terms of their readiness levels. Although a person new to an agency might require a high degree of structure, at least temporarily, a seasoned professional might be most effective when led with a delegating style. It is important that the leader assess followers as individuals in terms of their readiness for particular tasks, and then use the appropriate style for each person and situation. In spite of the limitations in the various contingency theories, Yukl (2006) has offered some useful practice guidelines which are; maintaining a situational awareness will help a leader choose an approach appropriate to the follower and situation. More planning will be needed for complex tasks, and more direction will be needed when teams have members with interdependent roles. More direction may also be needed in a crisis situation. This approach suggests a more consultative approach with people who have relevant knowledge and more coaching of an inexperienced follower. Critical tasks or unreliable followers may require closer monitoring, and those working on a stressful task should receive support.

Charismatic Leadership
Charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1998) will be briefly discussed here as a prelude to the full discussion on current well-developed models of leadership, some of which include elements of charismatic leadership. A charismatic leader is a strong role model who demonstrates competence and confidence, articulates goals, and communicates high expectations (Northouse, 2004). Charismatic leaders foster the development of trust and can inspire followers to a new vision through self-sacrifice, risk taking, and a concern for followers. It should also be noted that charismatic leadership is risky: Power can be misused, and followers can become inappropriately dependent upon a charismatic leader (Yukl, 2006).
Also, as noted by Collins (2001), effective leaders do not need to be strongly charismatic in the traditional sense of “larger than life heroes” such as Lee Iacocca at Chrysler. (Iacocca, 2007). In fact, his research found that leadership attributes included a “paradoxical blend” of humility and a fearless determination to succeed, concluding that “Charisma can be as much a liability as an asset, as the strength of your leadership personality can deter people from bringing you the brutal facts”. The challenge here is to demonstrate the characteristics noted without displaying an oversized personal presence, which puts more emphasis on the person than the organization.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Currently, one of the most popular and studied models of leadership contrasts two related approaches: transformational leadership and transactional leadership. Much of the current work on this model has been reported by Bass and associates (Stewart, 2006). In transactional leadership, the more common approach, an exchange process involves the leader and followers agreeing to do or provide things to accommodate each other’s needs. In transformational leadership, the leader “transforms and motivates followers by (1) making them more aware of the importance of task outcomes, (2) inducing them to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization or team, and (3) activating their higher-order needs” (Yukl, 2006). Transactional leadership has two components.

First, contingent rewards are valued rewards received for performing desired behaviors. A transactional leader identifies factors that motivate a worker and provides the support needed for effective performance.

Second, management by exception assumes that under normal circumstances, little intervention by a supervisor will be necessary. When exceptions (variations from routine activities) occur, management by exception is used. A leader can use active or passive management by exception. In active management by exception, the leader “arranges to actively monitor deviances from standards, mistakes, and errors that occur and to take corrective action as necessary.” (Bass, 1998).

In passive management by exception, the supervisor does not actively monitor but waits for deviations or mistakes to occur and then acts. To effectively lead professional staff, transactional leadership will probably not be enough to achieve outstanding performance. Transactional leadership should be augmented by the use of transformational leadership, which includes idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Idealized Influence: Idealized influence “refers to the ability of leaders to display conviction, emphasize trust, take stands on controversial issues, present their most important values, and emphasize the importance of purpose, commitment, and ethical consequences of decisions” (Bargal, 2000) in Mary Katherine O’Connor, F. Ellen Netting. According to Bass (1998), a transformational leader serves as a role model who is admired, respected, and trusted. Followers of such charismatic leaders “identify with the leaders and want to emulate them”; perceive them to have “extraordinary capabilities, persistence, and determination”; and see them as risk takers who are “consistent rather than arbitrary”. The application of idealized influence essentially amounts to being a role model and exhibiting behaviors that subordinates admire and appreciate.

Inspirational Motivation: A key component of inspirational motivation is vision. The overuse of this concept in the popular press and misapplications in organizations has led to cynicism on the part of some employees. However, when properly executed, visionary
leadership can be a powerful tool for focusing and energizing staff. Visionary leadership is briefly discussed below as a specific model of leadership. Another important aspect of this element is setting high expectations for the work unit or program. Enthusiasm and encouragement are then used by the leader to pull the team toward the vision and achievement of expected results.

**Intellectual Stimulation**: Intellectual stimulation involves encouraging innovation and creativity. To enhance this, Bargal (2000) suggests that the leader develop the ability to “question old assumptions, traditions, and beliefs; to stimulate new perspectives and ways of doing things and to encourage expression of new ideas and reasoning”. This includes the current management axiom of “thinking outside the box.” This principle is particularly important at the early stages for assessing the need for change.

**Individualized Consideration**: Individualized consideration involves coaching and mentoring workers as individuals and having ongoing personalized interactions with staff. Individual consideration involves finding ways for followers to identify growth goals and providing opportunities for them to achieve them. This can take the form of an explicit discussion with a follower, simply asking what is important to them and how these things can be achieved in a work setting.

According to Avolio and Bass (2002), the best leaders use more transformational leadership than transactional leadership, but both used together are optimally effective. Finally, it is also important to note that transformational leadership can be confused with “pseudo transformational leadership,” which focuses on personal power, manipulation, threat, and punishment. Yukl (2006) has offered several guidelines for the use of transformational leadership which are: the articulation of a clear and appealing vision, and the explanation of how it can be attained, Acting confidently and optimistically, expressing confidence in followers, Supporting the vision through resource allocation, emphasizing on key values, and leading by example.

Summarizing researches over the past 20 years, Bass & Avolio (2006) concluded that transformational leadership is positively related to performance in the business, military, educational, government, and not-for-profit sectors. One meta-analysis of Full-Range Leadership, which includes the use of both transactional and transformational leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), found that both transformational leadership and contingent rewards had significant relationships with outcomes, including follower satisfaction and group or organizational performance. In a review of the literature, Tucker & Russell (2004) concluded that transformational leaders can have major influences on organizational culture and change.

Yukl (2006) concluded that, in spite of conceptual weaknesses in the theory, “the available evidence supports many of the key propositions of the major theories of charismatic and transformational leadership”. Similarly Barker, Sullivan, & Emery, (2006); Packard, (2004); Yoo & Brooks, (2005) asserted that there have been applications of transformational leadership concepts to human services, and in another national study, transformational leadership was correlated with perceived leader effectiveness (Mary, 2005).

Similarly, in a hospital study, transformational leadership was significantly correlated with leader outcomes of effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort (Gellis,
2001). Another study found significant positive relationships between transformational leadership and job satisfaction, commitment, leader effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leader (Kays, 1993, cited in Mary, 2005). Transformational leadership is compatible with human services values and principles as it regards the valuing and empowering of individuals.

Exemplary Leadership

Kouzes & Posner’s (2002) popular books on leadership, unlike some of the popular literature, present a model with an empirical base. While they have not formally named their model, it depicts the qualities of an exemplary leader. They asserted that exemplary leaders enable others to act by fostering collaboration through trust and cooperative goals and at the same time sharing power and discretion, and encourage the heart by showing appreciation for individual excellence and celebrating values and victories through a community spirit and ended up by pointing out the several characteristics that people look for and admire in a leader which are:

- Honesty: been truthful, ethical, principled and worthy of trust.
- Forward-looking: been able to articulate a vision and sense of direction for the organization; using strategic planning and forecasting.
- Competent: having a track record and the ability to get things done and at the same time having an understanding of the fundamentals and having the relevant experience.
- Inspiring: been enthusiastic, energetic and positive about the future.

They concluded that these four characteristics are the source credibility that makes people believe and trust them because; they do what they say they will do, represented by the acronym DWYSYWD. “Do what you say you will do” which requires a leader practicing what he or she preaches. That is, “walk the talk,” and follow through.

Visionary Leadership

Vision has been mentioned in several contexts above, including transformational leadership and exemplary leadership, and because it is mentioned so often in the leadership literature, it will be given special attention here. According to Nanus & Dobbs (1999), a vision is “a realistic, credible, attractive, and inspiring future for the organization”. The vision should be challenging, but staff also needs to see that, with time and enough of the right kind of work, it is attainable. While a mission statement describes why an organization exists (its purpose) and what it does (its unique niche of programs or activities), a vision statement represents where the organization wants to be, its ideal future. Articulating a clear and compelling vision is an important aspect of leadership and, as will be discussed below, of change leadership in order to provide meaning, focus, and clarity of purpose for staff on an ongoing basis, and it may be even more important when organizational change is needed. The organization as a whole typically has a vision statement, and individual programs may have their own vision statements as well. Individual employees come to an organization with their own visions for what they want to accomplish in their careers. It is important for a leader to learn about his or her followers’ aspirations, build these into the organization vision as possible, and help followers see how their individual visions can be realized through a common vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Ultimately, all of these visions should be in alignment for vision congruence (Senge, 1990) not withstanding that the initial vision statement typically will come from the organization’s leader but alignment can be facilitated by having employees involved
in creating a final vision statement and then promulgating it throughout the organization. This can occur through a visioning process or, if necessary, through a larger process of culture change or organizational change, as described below.

**Servant-Leadership**

Servant-leadership, developed by retired AT&T executive Robert Greenleaf (2002), has received increasing attention through popular literature in recent years. It is a non-traditional model for leadership in several respects. It was developed by a successful career executive; it is explicitly based in philosophical, ethical, and moral principles; and it presents the unorthodox idea that the leader should first serve followers. Servant-leadership focuses on the leader follower relationship and can be considered to be in the style category of leadership models because it focuses on leader behaviours.

Spears (2005) has identified 10 characteristics of the servant-leader, many of which are clearly associated with social work and other human services professions: listening, empathy, healing “broken spirits” and “emotional hurts,” general and self-awareness, using persuasion rather than positional authority, broad conceptual thinking and visioning, learning from the past and foreseeing future outcomes, stewardship (“holding their institutions in trust for the greater good of society”), commitment to the growth of people, and building community. Until recent years, much of the writing on servant-leadership emphasized the description of desired behaviors and principles, but research on this model is expanding. A professional journal devoted to it, *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership*, was launched in 2005.

**Strategic Leadership**

The conceptualization of strategic leadership (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001) contrasts the “supervisory theories” of leadership, including contingency, path-goal, and leader-member exchange approaches, with strategic leadership approaches including charismatic, transformational, and visionary models. Activities often associated with strategic leadership include making strategic decisions; creating and communicating a vision of the future; developing key competencies and capabilities; developing organizational structures, processes, and controls; managing multiple constituencies; selecting and developing the next generation of leaders; sustaining an effective organizational culture; and infusing ethical value systems into an organization’s culture (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001).

Boal & Hooijberg (2001) further suggest that the “essence” of strategic leadership involves the ability to learn, the ability to change, and managerial wisdom, which includes social intelligence and the ability to take the right action at the right time. As bluntly stated by Gill (2006), “Without strategies, vision is a dream”. Leadership and vision are focused on end results, and organizational strategies can provide a road map for reaching them. Learners and practitioners of management are aware of the importance of strategic planning. It is addressed here as an aspect of leadership, suggesting that effective leadership can increase the prospects of strategy implementation. Strategic leadership, in this sense, is largely the use of a comprehensive strategic planning process.

There can be a leadership dimension to this as well, using participative approaches to leadership by involving staff in the strategic planning process. Thus far, the discussion of leadership has generally focused on a leader’s role in ongoing operations of an agency. An increasingly important role for a leader in an organization is that of a change leader (Kotter, 1996). We will now discuss specifics of change leadership, with particular
emphasis on organizational change and on creating a high-performance organizational culture.

Leadership and Organizational Culture Change

Here, the focus is on how leaders can create or transform cultures (Hatch, 2000) to deliver high-quality, effective services and on the kinds of leadership associated with a culture that is supportive of effective services. This is because culture is a medium through which leadership travels and impacts organizational performance. Leaders play an important role in “embedding” and transmitting (Schein, 2004) the culture that they believe will mostly enhance organizational functioning. Schein (2004) has identified six “primary embedding mechanisms”:

- What leaders pay attention to, measure, and control on a regular basis
- How leaders react to critical incidents and organizational crises
- How leaders allocate resources
- Deliberate role modeling, teaching, and coaching
- How leaders allocate and reward status
- How leaders recruit, select, promote, and excommunicate.

Schein (2004) also identified six “secondary articulation and reinforcement mechanisms,” which a leader can use to shape culture as:

- Organizational design and structure
- Organizational systems and procedures
- Rites and rituals of the organization
- Design of physical space, facades, and buildings, including symbols
- Stories about important events and people
- Formal statements of organizational philosophy, creeds, and charters.

Similarly, administrative mechanisms such as these can help shape a culture as humanistic or bureaucratic, performance or process focused, and team or individual oriented. Specifically, in the human resources area, supervisors as leaders can function as agents of socialization by the ways they assess, develop, coach, counsel, and give feedback to staff.

Accordingly, Leaders give staff important clues based on the aspects of the organization they want attention to be paid to. For example, if leaders focus on agency outcome data and the functioning of teams, they are likely to get different results than if they focus on following procedures and power struggles for resources. If leaders allocate resources for diversity initiatives and allocate rewards based on improved client outcomes through evidence-based practices and collaboration, employees will get clues regarding what is important. Employees know how to look beyond merely what a leader says in meetings or newsletters to see what behaviours the leader models on a daily basis.

Organizational culture change will be addressed more fully in the later section on organizational change. Here, just few comments are made regarding the uniqueness of culture change. Culture change will be presented below as a large-scale transformational change in the way the organization operates. Such a change requires new thinking and perspectives on the part of employees, and thus is extremely challenging and complicated and typically can only occur over a period of time (years).

From an individual employee’s perspective, Schein (2004) has used Lewin’s classic concepts of unfreezing, changing, and refreezing to illustrate how employees...
experience the culture change. Unfreezing creates disequilibrium in employees’ cognitive structure by presenting disconfirming data, which leads an employee to believe that current conditions are no longer comfortable. This, of course, creates psychological anxiety, which must be addressed by the leader creating psychological safety, so that staff will feel safe in trying out new ways of operating. These new behaviors and attitudes are reinforced and rewarded by leadership, thus refreezing a new or modified organizational culture.

Schein (2004) has suggested several tactics to create psychological safety for staff. First, as mentioned above, a compelling vision for a new future can show how the organization can be improved. Formal and informal training, with active involvement of staff in the learning process, can be supported by “practice fields” where it is safe to try new behaviors, supported by coaches and useful feedback. Leaders act as role models for the new ways of thinking, and support groups can aid staff in the learning process. Finally, management systems, including structures and rewards, need to be set up in alignment with the new thinking.

Schein (2004) makes an additional point about how to view “culture change”. While leaders often state culture change as the change goal, Schein asserts that a change goal should be stated in terms of desired organizational outcomes, not a process of culture change. In other words, culture change is not an end in itself, but a process in service of the larger goal of improving operations and outcomes of the organization. In summary, Schein (2004) suggests that creating a new culture requires that leaders have vision, persistence, patience, and both flexibility and readiness regarding change. They also need the ability to perceive the problem, insight and self-awareness regarding their strengths and limitations, strong motivation for change, emotional strength to handle the inevitable anxiety and criticism, the ability to bring to the surface and change existing culture assumptions, and the ability to involve others in the change process.

While the most important goal of culture change is to improve organizational performance, the creation of a culture that is committed to ongoing learning is also very important intermediate goal because organizational learning is a key aspect of organizational change. Austin & Hopkins (2004) and their colleagues have presented a variety of strategies for creating a learning organization and a culture of learning, including the design of “learning settings” (Garvin, 2000, cited in Austin & Hopkins, 2004). Regular organizational activities, such as staff meetings and outcomes assessments, can be augmented to become arenas for learning by a leader demonstrating a personal investment in learning, asking questions, empowering staff through shared decision making, using data in problem analysis and problem solving, and making time for reflection and the application of new knowledge, fostering dissent and risk taking, regular questioning and listening, and celebrating and rewarding individual learning. The leader should also demonstrate personal commitment to learning through openness, an awareness of personal biases, a full use of data, and personal humility.

**Code of Ethics/Moral Principles**

As noted by Sev (2002), a code of ethic is a written document that outlines the principles of conduct to be used in making decisions within the organization. Codes of ethics are formal standards and rules on beliefs about right or wrong that managers can use to help themselves, make appropriate decisions with regards to the interest of the stakeholders.

Codes of ethics are based on one or more of these philosophical approaches of justices, individual right and utilitarianism. According to Gomez-Mejia et al (2005) and
Freeman (1991) managers typically use one of 4 key ethical approaches when making decisions.

**Justice Approach:** is approach to decision making based on treating all people fairly consistently when making business decisions. Justice has two phases; “distributive justice” which examines the fairness of punishment and outcomes in an organization and “procedural justice” which involves the fair and consistence application of rules and procedures.

**Individual Right Approach:** concerns making decisions based on the belief that each person has fundamental human rights which should be respected and protected in the cause of decision making.

**Utilitarianism:** This principle involves making decisions based on what is good for the greatest number of people. To apply the utilitarian criterion, one would examine all the people affected by the decision and choose the solution that satisfies the most people. It is sometimes referred to as “calculus of pain” because it tries to minimize pain and maximize pleasure for the greatest number of people.

**Individualism:** is the a degree to which a society values personal goals, autonomy and privacy over group loyalty, commitment to group norms, involvement in collective activities, social cohesiveness an intense socialization; ethical decision based on individualism promote individual self-interest as long as it does not harm others.

Hodgson Kent (1992), a management consultant has helpfully taken managers a step closer to ethical decisions by identifying seven (7) general moral principles which are supportive to organizational climate that specifies do’s and don’ts that fosters ethical decisions. These magnificent seven (7) general moral principles for managers are:

**Dignity of Human Life:** The lives of people are to be protected and respected. Human beings, by the fact of their existence, have value and dignity of life.

**Autonomy:** All persons are intrinsically valuable and have the right to self-determination. We should act in ways that demonstrate each person’s worth, dignity and right to free choice.

**Honesty:** the truth should be told to those who have a right to know, it is also known as integrity, truth telling and honor.

**Loyalty:** promises, contracts and commitments should be honored. Loyalty include fidelity, promise keeping, keeping the public trust, good citizenship, excellence in quality of work, reliability, commitment and honoring just laws, rules and policies.

**Fairness:** people should be treated justly. One has the right to be treated fairly and justly.

**Humanness:** there is one thing which our actions ought to accomplish which is the greatest good for the greatest number of people. One should act and speak in ways that benefit the welfare of the largest number of people, while trying to protect the life of individuals.
Codes of ethics should be formal, written and communicated to all employees. According to Rue & Byors (2000) and Ezigbo (2008), the codes of ethics cover a list of areas which include the following:

- Fundamental honesty and adherence to the law
- Health and safety in the workplace
- Product safety and quality
- Conflict of interest
- Employment practices
- Fairness in selling/marketing practices
- Financing reporting
- Supplier relationship
- Pricing, billing and contracting
- Trading in securities
- Acquiring and using information from others
- Political activities
- Protection of the environment
- Intellectual/property information.

**Review of Empirical Studies**

Obicci, (2014) investigated the effects of ethical leadership on employee performance in the public sector in Uganda. A target population of 160 employees was surveyed. A structured questionnaire was self-administered to the employees to collect the data. Regression analysis and Pearson correlation coefficient were used to explain the nature of the relationship between ethical leadership and employee performance and the effects thereof. Results of the study reveal that employee performance is greatly influenced by ethical leadership.

Sabir et al (2012) examine the impact of corporate ethical values on ethical leadership and employee performance in Pakistan. This research was conducted considering three variables i.e. corporate ethical values, ethical leadership and employee performance. Leadership having no ethical manners can be harmful, vicious and even poisonous. Although there is enough discussion regarding corporate ethical values and ethical leadership in this research, very few research work has been done so far in relation to the mediating effect of ethical leadership on corporate ethical values and employee performance. It is also found that a corporate ethical value is the most important factor for ethical leadership and employee performance. So, the two variables collectively prove a photogenic effect and augment the overall productivity of the employees.

Dorasamy, (2010) looks at the possible contribution of a purpose directed leadership approach within the South African public service toward enhancing ethical behavior which can ultimately translate into improved public service delivery. He devoted his attention to the capacity of such an approach in creating a milieu of commitment toward service excellence, he argues that unethical behavior in the public service has impacted on the quality of service delivery in many government departments in South Africa. A review of reports by the Public Service Commission and the media suggest that quality public service delivery has been affected by the lack of an ethical culture within purpose directed leadership. Through a detailed review of literature and documents relating to poor public service delivery in South Africa, it has become imperative to explore the effect of ethical and purpose-directed leadership on public service delivery.
The article further argued that through ethical and purpose-driven leadership, the mission statement of the public service is not only communicated to all concerned, but it is also clarified and understood and becomes the driving force in delivering what is to be achieved, without compromising the quality of public services. Performance in support of the purpose can be the building blocks upon which an ethical culture is developed throughout all government departments. Public leaders must therefore use the organizational purpose as a frame of reference for the execution of all functions within the organization so that public satisfaction can be best achieved, without compromising ethical behaviour. The public service needs to accord greater importance and focus to leadership based on purpose-driven activities to address some of the ethical issues affecting quality service delivery and some of these ethical issues include conflict of interest, mismatch post appointments and lack of commitment to quality service delivery. By adhering to the purpose, the principles of public service delivery beyond personal aspirations and ambitions are prioritized. The study is contextualized through a general overview of the role of leadership, within an ethical and purpose-directed framework, in promoting quality services in the public sector.

Arowolo, (2012) studied Ethics, Motivation and Performance in Nigeria’s Public Service and asserted that public policy and administration research performance of Nigerian public service has been a major concern to policy makers and researchers as well. This is because despite all measures put in place to arrest performance failure, the service, it seems, has defied all approaches towards tackling the problem of inefficiency and capacity collapse. He further looked at how ethics and motivation of public servants can enhance public service performance in the area of service delivery by linking strict adherence to ethics and motivation to performance. It adopted content analysis as a method of data gathering and analysis.

Piccolo, et al (2010) drew on the original job characteristics model (JCM) and on an elaborated model of work design to examine relationships between ethical leadership, task significance, job autonomy, effort, and job performance. They conducted a field study by surveying pairs of co-workers in a diverse set of organizations. Results provide support for a fully mediated model whereby task significance and effort fully mediate relationships between ethical leadership and subordinates’ job performance.

Aamir, (2014) seeks to find answers to the question “Can ethical leadership enhance employees work engagement”? He resolved that research on work engagement has witnessed a dramatic increase in the last decade and two factors have contributed to this sudden wave of interest in the concept of work engagement. First, the recent trend towards positive psychology with its thrust on human strengths, wellbeing and optimal functioning, has evoked a general interest in positive states and as a result has catapulted the construct of work engagement into prominence (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Second, the importance of work engagement has been enhanced because past research has provided compelling evidence, which suggests that high levels of work engagement can make a significant contribution to the firm’s bottom line (Gruman & Saks, 2011). Work engagement refers to a “positive, fulfilling work related state of mind that is characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption” (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma & Bakker, 2002,). Vigour refers to the exhibition of high levels of energy and mental resilience while working. Dedication reflects a strong work involvement and encompasses feelings of enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, significance, and challenge. The final dimension of engagement is absorption. This component refers to being fully immersed in one’s work.
in a way that time appears to fly by and one finds it excessively difficult to disengage oneself from work.

Walumbwa, et al (2009) investigated the link between ethical leadership and performance using data from the People’s Republic of China. Consistent with social exchange, social learning, and social identity theories, they examined leader–member exchange (LMX), self-efficacy, and organizational identification as mediators of the ethical leadership to performance relationship. Results from 72 supervisors and 201 immediate past supervisors direct reports revealed that ethical leadership is positively and significantly related to employee performance as rated by their immediate supervisors and that this relationship is fully mediated by LMX, self-efficacy, and organizational identification, controlling for procedural fairness. They discuss implications of their findings for theory and practice.

In summary, despite the importance of ethical leadership and ethical behaviour in organizations, research investigating the potential mechanisms through which ethical leadership influences effective performance has been lacking. This study makes an important contribution by examining how and why ethical leadership is more effective in enhancing performance by highlighting the importance of productive, employees’ job motivation, and employees’ job satisfaction. Thus, providing a more complete picture of translating ethical leadership and ethical behaviour in organizations to enhance employees’ effective performance.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In order to analyze the impact of leadership style on organizational performance in a far reaching and inclusive way, the study used the quantitative technique and to obtain more accurate data, the questionnaire was used which contained two sections, (The demographic section and the subjective section). The Demographic section took care of gender, age, income and occupation while the subjective section took care of the others. The questionnaire which was designed to collect data from the targeted population contained 16 items which were scaled on a 5-points Likert scale to compute and assess the responses and 317 valid questionnaires were returned and the descriptive statistics and the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient were the statistical tools used for the analysis, while the statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 20 was used for Data analysis.

**Data Presentation and Analysis**

A total number of 317 questionnaires containing sixteen (16) questions were administered while only 253 were returned and their responses meticulously analysed below:

**Data Reliability and Validity Test**

In order to ensure internal reliability and validity of the data and the instrument used, the Cronbach’s alpha was computed using SPSS. The value of Cronbach’s Alpha in respect to Productivity, Motivation and Satisfaction were 0.986, 0.984, and 0.756 respectively. All values are above the standard value 0.70 proposed by Nunnally, (1978). This indicates that our data and instrument is reliable and we can confidently apply different statistical tests and interpret the results with confidence.
Table 1: Leadership in my organisation is built on ethical principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 1 above, shows that 120 respondents representing 49.4% strongly agreed that leadership in their organization is built on ethical principles, 80 respondents representing 31.6% Agreed, 7 respondents representing 2.8% neutral (not sure) 26 respondents representing 10.3% Disagree and 20 respondents representing 7.9% strongly disagree.

Table 2: Corrupt leadership is not allowed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

On the second statement, 140 respondents representing 55.3% strongly agreed that corrupt leadership is not allowed, 90 respondents representing 35.6% Agreed, 5 respondents representing 2.0% Neutral, 10 respondents representing 4.0% disagreed 8 respondents representing 3.2% strongly disagree.

Table 3: Leadership in the organization is accountable to the lead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The table above showed that 115 respondents representing 45.5% strongly agreed that leadership in the organization is accountable to the lead, 125 respondents representing
49.4% Agreed, 3 respondents representing 1.2% Neutral, 6 respondents representing 2.4% disagreed, 4 respondents representing 1.6% strongly disagree.

Table 4: Things are done right by leaders in my organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

On the fourth question 137 respondents representing 54.2% strongly agreed that things are done right by leaders in their organization, 97 respondents representing 38.3% Agreed, 4 respondents representing 1.6% were undecided, 9 respondents representing 3.6% Disagreed and 6 respondents representing 2.4% strongly disagree.

Table 5: I am highly motivated when compared to employees of other government organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 6: I do my work accurately and timely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015
Table 6 shows that 99 respondents representing 39.1% strongly agreed that they do their work accurately and timely, 120 respondents representing 47.4% Agreed, 13 respondents representing 5.1% Neutral, 6 respondents representing 2.4% disagreed and 15 respondents representing 5.9% strongly disagree.

Table 7: I discuss work issues at home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

In Table 7, 97 respondents representing 38.3% strongly agreed that they discuss work issues at home, 139 respondents representing 54.9% Agreed, 7 respondents representing 2.8% Neutral, 6 respondents representing 2.4% Disagreed and 4 respondents representing 1.6% strongly disagree.

Table 8: I participate in training programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 8 shows that 122 respondents representing 48.2% strongly agree that they participate in training programmes, 102 respondents representing 40.3% Agreed, 9 respondents representing 3.6% Neutral 11 respondents representing 4.3% and 9 respondents representing 3.6% strongly disagrees.

Table 9: I feel satisfied with my job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015
In table 9 above, 80 respondents representing 31.6% strongly agree that, they feel satisfied with their job, 73 respondents representing 28.9% agreed, 50 respondents representing 19.8% Neutral, 50 respondents representing 19.8% disagreed while none of the respondent strongly disagrees.

Table 10: I am satisfied with the reward system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 10 shows that 111 respondents representing 43.9% strongly agree that they are satisfied with the reward system, 102 respondents representing 40.3% agreed, 11 respondents representing 4.3% Neutral, 16 respondents representing 6.3% Disagreed and 13 respondents representing 5.1% strongly disagree.

Table 11: I am satisfied with the chances of promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 11 shows that 97 respondents representing 38.3% strongly agree that, they are satisfied with the chances of promotion, 103 respondents representing 40.7% agreed, 33 respondents representing 13.0% neutral, 14 respondents representing 5.5% disagreed and 6 respondents representing 2.4% strongly disagree.

Table 12: I am satisfied with the recognition I get for good work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015
Table 12 shows that 153 respondents representing 60.5% strongly agreed that, they are satisfied with the recognition they got for good work, 81 respondents representing 32.0% agreed, 4 respondents representing 1.6% neutral, 9 respondents representing 3.6% disagreed and 6 respondents representing 2.4% strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 13: Employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very high</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 13 shows that 2 respondent representing 0.8% indicated very low performance for employee in the organization, 3 respondents representing 1.2% Low, 12 respondents representing 4.7% not sure, 108 respondents representing 42.7% high, and 128 respondents representing 50.6% very high.

Table 14: Employee commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very high</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

In table 14 above, 2 respondents representing 0.8% showed that, employee commitment is very low, 2 respondents representing 0.8% low, 3 respondents representing 1.2% not sure, 109 respondents representing 43.1% high and137 respondents representing 54.2% very high.

Table 15: Quality of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very high</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015
In table 15 above, 3 respondents representing 1.2% response that quality of work is very low, 4 respondents representing 1.6% low, 2 respondents representing 0.8% undecided, 111 respondents representing 43.9% high, and 133 respondents representing 52.6% very high.

**Table 16: Efficiency/ Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very high</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Finally, in table 16, 6 respondents representing 2.4% indicated that efficiency/effectiveness is very low, 6 respondents representing 2.4% low 7 respondents representing 2.8% not sure, 107 respondents representing 42.3% high and 127 respondents representing 50.2% rates efficiency/effectiveness very high.

**Test of Research Hypotheses**

This section provides a test of research hypotheses earlier formulated in the study. This was done using the results of the correlation coefficients. The researcher here will examines the level of significance or insignificance of each correlation coefficient in respect to each hypothesis so as to enable a decision to be made as to whether to accept or reject the study’s formulated null hypotheses. The test is presented in the following three subsections.

**Test of Research Hypothesis One**

**H₀₁**: There is no significant relationship between leadership ethics and employees’ productivity at Dangote Cement Company Plc. Gboko. Plant

**Table 17: Correlations Results showing Relationship between Leadership ethics and employees’ Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership ethics</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership ethics</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.972**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: SPSS Version 20 Output
Table 17 shows that there is a statistical positive relationship between leadership ethics and employees’ productivity at Dangote Cement Company, Gboko plant (r = 0.972, p< 0.05). This implies that there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and employees’ productivity at Dangote Cement Company, Gboko plant. Therefore, the study rejects the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance, and concludes that there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and employees’ productivity at Dangote Cement Company Plc., Gboko Plant.

Test of Research Hypothesis Two

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between leadership ethics and employee motivation at Dangote Cement Company Plc., Gboko Plant.

Table 18: Correlations Results showing Relationship between Leadership Ethics and Employees’ Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership ethics</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership ethics</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.969**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: SPSS Version 20 Output

Table 18 shows that there is a statistical positive relationship between leadership ethics and employees motivation (r = 0.969, p< 0.05). This implies that there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and employees motivation at Dangote Cement Company Plc., Gboko Plant. The study therefore rejects the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance, and concludes that there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and employees motivation.

Test of Research Hypothesis Three

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between leadership ethics and employee job satisfaction at Dangote Cement Company Plc., Gboko Plant.

Table 19: Correlations Results showing Relationship between Leadership Ethics and Employee Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership ethics</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership ethics</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.628**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: SPSS Version 20 Output
Table 19 shows that there is a statistical positive relationship between leadership ethics and employee job satisfaction (r = 0.628, p< 0.05). This implies that there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and employee job satisfaction. Therefore, the study rejects the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance, and concludes that there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and employee job satisfaction at Dangote Cement Company Plc., Gboko Plant.

**Discussion of Findings**

In the test of hypothesis one, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was applied to establish whether there is significant relationship between leadership ethics and productivity. The SPSS analysis revealed a correlation coefficient value of 0.628 with significance value of .000, which this is less than the level of significant at 0.05. we therefore, reject the null hypothesis at the 0.05 automatically increase the organization’s productivity, market share and performance. Finding also collaborates with findings of Arowolo, (2012) who studied the correlation between ethics, motivation and performance in the level of significance and conclude that there is significant relationship between leadership ethics and productivity. This finding is consistent with the views of Sabir, Iqbal, Rehman & Yameen, (2012) that corporate ethical values play a dominant role to enhance ethical leadership and to increase employee performance for the achievement of the organizational goals, which will public service. It focused on the effects of well-designed ethics on public service and concluded that, where standard ethics are practiced, better performance is assured and where unethical behaviour prevails, performance is negatively affected. It therefore implied that the more moral and principled the head of organizations like Dangote Cement Company, Gboko, and plant are, the more employees of such organizations will put in their best and vice versa bringing about higher or lower productivity of the organization as the case may be.

The result obtained from testing hypothesis two after applying the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient statistical tool to determine whether there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and motivation, showed that there is a significant relationship between motivation and productivity since correlation coefficient value of 0.969, with significant value of 0.000, which is less than the level of significance at 0.05. The study therefore rejects the null hypothesis at 0.05 and concludes that there is significant relationship between leadership ethics and motivation. This is in line with Bryant assertion that, leadership ethics result in a high level of followers’ motivation, commitment and well-above average organizational performance, especially under conditions of crisis or uncertainty. (Bryant, 2003). This finding also corroborates the views of Trevino et al., (2003) who concluded that leaders with ethical norms and values lead by persuading their employees and supporters. The implication of this is that leadership hinged on well-defined moral principles can bring about an inspired and motivated employees’ who are ready to put in their best in the organization as is the case of Dangote Cement Company, Gboko plant.

Finally, in the test of the third hypothesis of the study, the SPSS result showed that there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and employee job satisfaction since the correlation coefficient value of 0.628, with significant value of 0.000, is less than the 5% level of significance. The study therefore rejects the null hypothesis at 0.05 and conclude that there is a strong significant relationship between leadership ethics and job satisfaction. This finding is in line with the submissions of Hira & waqas,
(2012) who concluded that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. It therefore follows that organizations with highly ethical leadership will bring about highly motivated and satisfied employees who will not want to live their organizations for others since they are contented.

Conclusion

An effective and efficient service has to be driven by a leadership which prioritizes the needs of the public and as such, a utilitarian approach of showing concern for the broader welfare of the public should not be compromised for the imperatives of personal enrichment and self-interest. Such egoistic imperatives lead to ethical degeneration. Public leaders must buy into the purpose of government departments, align their personal values with institutional values and guide decision making with integrity. When leaders show commitment and consistency in their behaviour, subordinates are influenced to do likewise. All of this is embodied in an ethics based culture founded upon purpose-driven leadership. In conformity with the findings of this study, it can therefore be concluded that there is a significant relationship between leadership ethics and organizational productivity, employee’s motivation and employee’s job satisfaction and as such, the more a leader anchored his leadership on strong ethical values, the more the organization will be productive, through motivated and satisfied employees and vice versa. Therefore, for an organization to be effective, it needs ethical leaders.

Recommendations

For leaders and managers in private owned companies, agencies and other related organization to be able to achieve organizational objective of productivity, job motivation and employee satisfaction, the following recommendations have becomes imperative.

1. It is, therefore, desirable for managers of private organization to adhere strictly to standard ethics and direct motivation to meet employees’ needs in order to enhance better performance, efficiency and high productivity in public service, thereby facilitating overall service delivery and national development.

2. Bureaucratic corruption needs to be curbed in order to have more funds for motivation of both private and public employees and provision of services for the people. Merit should be promoted and indolence and indiscipline should be seriously discouraged. Mechanism should be put in place to punish public servants that are found to have been corrupt or have aided corrupt tendencies.

3. Management of Dangote Cement Company, Gboko should ensure that all staff due for promotion should be promoted to enhance employees’ job satisfaction. In addition, allowance and bonuses for job hazard and risk accidents should be paid to the employees’ in order to motivate them and increase their level of job satisfaction and thus organizational productivity.
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