

LEADERSHIP STYLE AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIAN OIL AND GAS SECTOROLABODE, Segun Oluwaseun^{1*}; BAKARE Akeem Abayomi²; IHEONUNEKWU, Wowo³Department of Management Technology, Faculty of Management Sciences, Lagos State University, Lagos, Nigeria^{1,2,3}.**Corresponding Author:** segun.olabode@lasu.edu.ng**DOI:** 10.36108/ljerhrm/8102.01.0112**Abstract**

This study examined the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership styles and employee performance in the Nigerian oil and gas sector using Lubcon Oil and Orientry Ltd as study area. Survey design was adopted; a sample size of 100 was used representing the total population of the study, convenient sampling used to select the study firms while stratified sampling was used to samples from all departments in the firms. Copies of questionnaire were administered to members of staff of Lubcon oil using purposive sampling. The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. The analysis has shown that each of charisma, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation/individual consideration traits of transformational leadership style exerts positive and significant effect on both commitment and attitude of followers in the firm that adopts it most of the time, and a negative but insignificant effect on the commitment and also a positive but insignificant effect on their attitude in the firm that adopts it less of the time. On the other hand, each trait of transactional leadership style considered in this study, constructive/contingent reward and corrective and management by exception has strong positive and significant positive effect on attitude of employees, and a weak positive and insignificant effect of their commitment in the firm that adopts it most of the time, it also exerts weak positive but insignificant effect on both commitment and attitude of followers in the firm that adopts it little of the time. The study concludes that transformational leadership style is more appropriate in inducing employee performance in oil and gas firms than transactional leadership style. Consequently, the study recommends that oil and gas firms should adopt transformational leadership style but strategize to migrate to transactional leadership style during crisis and emergency situations.

Keywords: Employee performance, Leadership style, Transactional, Transformational

1.0 Introduction

The concept of leadership has become a fundamental issue in today's environment. Leading is the process of influencing others to accomplish specified objectives. Taffinder (as cited in Bass & Bass, 2008) defines leadership as getting people to do things they have never thought of doing, do not believe are possible or that they do not want to do, the action of committing employees to contribute their best to the purpose of the organization. Good leadership is developed through a never-ending process of self-study, education, training, and the accumulation of relevant experience (Bass & Bass, 2008).

It is increasingly accepted, however, that in order to be a good leader, one must have the experience, knowledge, commitment, patience, and most importantly the skill to negotiate and work with others to achieve goals. Trustworthiness is often key to positions of leadership as trust is fundamental to all manner of organized human groups, whether in education, business, the military, religion, government, or international organizations (Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2007). From the perspective of employees, leadership comprises everything a leader does that affects the achievement of objectives and the well-being of employees and the organization (Abbasialiya, 2010).

A good or effective leader inspires, motivates, and directs activities to help achieve group or organizational goals. According to Naylor (1999), effective leadership is a product of the heart; an effective leader must be visionary, passionate, creative, flexible, inspiring, innovative, courageous, imaginative, experimental, and initiates change. Conversely, an ineffective leader does not contribute to organizational progress and can, in fact, detract from organizational goal accomplishment.

Olembo and Karugu (2010) explain that leaders have the overall responsibility over the operations of an organization, it can therefore be said that leaders are accountable for an organization's performance. The job of leadership, according to Idowu (2008), involves among other things, coordinating both human and material resources to ensure the achievement of organizational goals. Scholars such as Millette (2012) has affirmed that the type of leadership styles adopted determines the performance of employees in an organization.

The term leadership style refers to a leader's manner of behavior in a work situation. According to Fiedler (1964), one's leadership style depends on one's personality and is therefore relatively fixed. Fundamentally, the leadership adopted is the one with which the person is most comfortable. This is dependent on the person's values, personality, and how comfortable it is to allow subordinates to participate in the decision-making process. Many of these characteristics are well developed by the time persons on the job would be considered for leadership positions. Meanwhile, many leaders, by means of training and introspection have been able to change their leadership style dramatically.

Zeffanne (2003) states that "the answer to the question of employee commitment, morale, loyalty and attachment may consist not only in providing motivators, but also to remove demotivators such as styles of management not suited to their context and to contemporary employee aspirations". Thus, a leadership or management style that encourages employee involvement can help to satisfy employee's desire for empowerment and demand for a commitment to organisational goals.

Obiwuru, Okwu, Akpa, and Nwankwere (as cited in Nizam & Shah, 2015) opine that the degree to which employees perform and contribute to the organization equally depends on how well the managers (leaders) of the organization understand and adopt appropriate leadership style at a particular time and a particular situation in performing their roles as managers and leaders. As such, employees' commitment, motivation, engagement and attitude to work, and enhancement of organizational performance depends, to a large extent, on leadership style, among other factors.

Several theories exist to explain leadership effectiveness. Two of the most important leadership theories are Transformational and Transactional leadership theories. Since the late 1980s, theories of transformational and charismatic leadership have been ascendant. Versions of transformational leadership have been proposed by several theorists, including Bass (1999).

However, most authors agree that Transactional and transformational leadership are different in concept and in practice, some authors like Bass and Riggio (2008); Howell and Avolio (1993); Lowe, Kroeck and Sivasubramaniam (1996) believe that transformational leadership significantly build upon transactional leadership, resulting in higher levels of employee, team, and organizational performance. Others like Wehrich, and Koontz (2008) believe that Transactional leadership is a subset of transformational leadership.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Performance of employees is affected by numerous factors at work place. Different researchers have attributed employee performance to several factors, and few have attributed it to leadership style. Researchers like Hammady, Burden, Evans and Davidson (2014); Nizam and Shah (2015); Saeed, Mussawar, Lodhi, Iqbal, Nayab and Yaseen (2013); identify leadership effectiveness, reward and recognition, career advancement opportunity, motivation, manager's attitude, organizational culture, personal problems, job content, and training and development as major factors. However, existing studies which focus on transformational and transactional leadership (Bass et al., 2003) are carried out in sectors and industries other than the oil and gas sector. In the oil and gas sector, the income of most employees may not necessarily allow their performance to be affected by transactional indicators like financial rewards. thus, there is still a dearth in knowledge on the how leadership styles (transactional and transformational) especially its impact on performance of employees in the oil and gas sector.

Therefore, this study examines the impact of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee commitment and attitude to work in the petroleum industry using Lubcon limited and Orientry limited with their headquarters in Lagos state Nigeria.

1.2 Research Objectives

The overall objective of the study is to determine the impact of leadership styles on employee performance in the petroleum industry. The specific objectives are:

- i To determine the relationship between transactional leadership style and employee commitment in both companies.

- ii To examine the relationship between transactional leadership style and employee attitude to work in both companies.
- iii To ascertain the correlation between transformational leadership style and employee commitment in both companies.
- iv To examine the relationship between transformational leadership style and employee attitude to work in both companies.

1.3 Research Questions

- i Does any relationship exist between transactional leadership style and employee's commitment in both companies?
- ii What kind of relationship exist between transactional leadership style and employee's attitude to work in both companies?
- iii What kind of correlation exist between transformational leadership style and employee's commitment in both companies?
- iv Does any relationship exist between transformational leadership style and employee's attitude to work in both companies?

1.4 Research Hypotheses

- i There is no relationship between transactional leadership style and employee commitment in both companies.
- ii There is no relationship between transactional leadership style and employee attitude to work in both companies.
- iii There is no relationship between transformational leadership style and employee commitment in both companies.
- iv There is no relationship between transformational leadership style and employee attitude to work in both companies.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This section analyzes two leadership theories: transformational leadership and transactional leadership. It begins with introductory comments about the academic field of leadership and continues with a look at the two theories, including their history and development, and proceeds to a micro-level, examining several recent published studies in each area. It presents a comparison and contrast of the key principles of each. The manuscript also discusses modern leadership challenges and leadership development in the context of the two theories.

2.2 Leadership Theories

One of the earliest studies of leadership, Galton's *Hereditary Genius* emphasized a basic concept that informed popular ideas about leadership (Zaccaro, 2007). The idea is that leadership is a characteristic ability of extraordinary individuals. This conception of leadership, known as the great man theory, evolved into the study of leadership traits, only to be supplanted later the theories under discussion here (Glynn & DeJordy, 2010). Before discussing leadership, it is useful to define the term. The question of the correct definition of leadership is a nontrivial matter. Rost (1993) discovered different definitions and conceptions of leadership. Some of those definitions were narrow while others offered broader conceptions. Bass (2000; 2008) argued that the search for a single definition of leadership was pointless. Among multiple definitions and conceptions, the correct definition of leadership depends on the specific aspect of leadership of interest to the individual (Bass, 2008). This study focuses on two specific conceptions of leadership: transformational and transactional.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Over the past 30 years, transformational leadership has been "the single most studied and debated idea with the field of leadership" (Diaz-Saenz, 2011). Published studies link transformational leadership to CEO success (Jung, 2008), middle manager effectiveness (Singh & Krishnan, 2008), military leadership (Eid, Johnsen, Bartone, & Nissestad, 2008), cross-cultural leadership (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009), virtual teams (Hambley, O'Neill, & Kline, 2007), personality (Hautala, 2006), emotional intelligence and a variety of other topics (Diaz-

Saenz, 2011). Burns (1978) operationalised the theory of transformational leadership as one of two leadership styles represented as a dichotomy: transformational and transactional leadership. While distinct from the concept of charismatic leadership charisma is an element of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; 1990; 2000; 2008; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Conger, 1999; 2011; Conger & Hunt, 1999; Diaz-Saenz, 2011). Burns (1978) defined a transformational leader as “one who raises the followers’ level of consciousness about the importance and value of desired outcomes and the methods of reaching those outcomes”. The transformational leader convinced his followers to transcend their self-interest for the sake of the organization, while elevating “the followers’ level of need on Maslow’s hierarchy from lower-level concerns for safety and security to higher-level needs for achievement and self-actualization” (Bass, 2008). Based on empirical evidence, Bass (1985) modified the original transformational leadership construct. Over time, four factors or components of transformational leadership emerged. These components include idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Researchers frequently group the first two components together as charisma (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The transformational leader exhibits each of these four components to varying degrees in order to bring about desired organizational outcomes through their followers (Bass 1985; 1990; 2000; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Idealized influence incorporates two separate aspects of the follower relationship. First, followers attribute the leader with certain qualities that followers wish to emulate. Second, leaders impress followers through their behaviors. Inspirational motivation involves behavior to motivate and inspire followers by providing a shared meaning and a challenge to those followers. Enthusiasm and optimism are key characteristics of inspirational motivation (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Intellectual stimulation allows leaders to increase their followers’ efforts at innovation by questioning assumptions, reframing known problems, and applying new frameworks and perspectives to old and established situations and challenges (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Intellectual stimulation requires openness on the part of the leader. Openness without fear of criticism and increased levels of confidence in problem solving situation combine to increase the self-efficacy of followers. Increased self-efficacy leads to increased effectiveness (Bandura, 1977). Individualized consideration involves acting as a coach or mentor in order to assist followers with reaching their full potential. Leaders provide learning opportunities and a supportive climate (Bass & Riggio, 2006). These four components combine to make leaders transformational figures. In spite of significant empirical support, a number of criticisms of transformational leadership theory exist.

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership focuses on the exchanges that occur between leaders and followers (Bass 1985; 1990; 2000; 2008; Burns, 1978). These exchanges allow leaders to accomplish their performance objectives, complete required tasks, maintain the current organizational situation, motivate followers through contractual agreement, direct behavior of followers toward achievement of established goals, emphasize extrinsic rewards, avoid unnecessary risks, and focus on improve organizational efficiency. In turn, transactional leadership allows followers to fulfill their own self-interest, minimize workplace anxiety, and concentrate on clear organizational objectives such as increased quality, customer service, reduced costs, and increased production (Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012). Burns (1978) operationalized the concepts of both transformational and transactional leadership as distinct leadership styles. Transactional leadership theory described by Burns (1978) posited the relationship between leaders and followers as a series of exchanges of gratification designed to maximize organizational and individual gains. Transactional leadership evolved for the marketplace of fast, simple transactions among multiple leaders and followers, each moving from transaction to transaction in search of gratification. The marketplace demands reciprocity, flexibility, adaptability, and real-time cost-benefit analysis (Burns, 1978). Empirical evidence supports the relationship between transactional leadership and effectiveness in some settings (Bass, 1985; 1999; 2000; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Hater & Bass, 1988; Zhu, Sosik, Riggio, & Yang, 2012). Today, researchers study transactional leadership within the continuum of the full range of leadership model (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Some researchers criticize transactional leadership.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a style of leadership whereby a leader works with subordinates to identify needed change, creating a vision to guide the change through inspiration, and executing the change in partnership with committed members of a group (Wikipedia, 2016). Transformational leadership enhances the motivation, morale, and job-performance of followers through a variety of mechanisms; these include connecting the follower’s sense of identity and self to a project and to the collective identity of the organization; being a role model for followers in order to inspire them and to raise their interest in the project; challenging followers to take

greater ownership for their work, and understanding the strengths and weaknesses of followers, allowing the leader to align followers with tasks that enhance their performance (Riggio, 2009).

Transformational leaders are described to hold positive expectations for followers, believing that they can do their best. As a result, they inspire, empower, and stimulate followers to exceed normal levels of performance. Transformational leaders also focus on and care about followers and their personal needs and development (Riggio, 2009). Transformational leaders fit well in leading and working with complex work groups and organizations, where beyond seeking an inspirational leader to help guide them through an uncertain environment, followers are also challenged and feel empowered; this nurture them into becoming loyal, high performers.

There are 4 components to transformational leadership as identified by Riggio (as cited in Nizam & Shah, 2015), sometimes referred to as the 4 I's:

- **Idealized Influence (II)** - the leader serves as an ideal role model for followers; the leader "walks the talk," and is admired for this.
- **Inspirational Motivation (IM)** - Transformational leaders have the ability to inspire and motivate followers. Combined these first two I's are what constitute the transformational leader's charisma.
- **Individualized Consideration (IC)** - Transformational leaders demonstrate genuine concern for the needs and feelings of followers. This personal attention to each follower is a key element in bringing out their very best efforts.
- **Intellectual Stimulation (IS)** - the leader challenges followers to be innovative and creative. A common misunderstanding is that transformational leaders are "soft," but the truth is that they constantly challenge followers to higher levels of performance.

Transformational leadership is said to have occurred when engagement in a group results in leaders and followers raising one another to increased levels of motivation and morality.

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership, also known as managerial leadership, focuses on supervision, organization, and performance; transactional leadership is a style of leadership in which leaders promote compliance by followers through both rewards and punishments. Unlike transformational leaders, those using the transactional approach are not looking to change the future, they look to keep things the same. Leaders using transactional leadership as a model pay attention to followers' work in order to find faults and deviations (Nizam & Shah, 2015).

This type of leadership is effective in crisis and emergency situations, as well as for projects that need to be carried out in a specific way (Nizam & Shah, 2015).

Leadership Styles and Employee Performance

According to Nyengane (2008), employee commitment reflects the quality of the leadership in the organisation. Therefore, it is logical to assume that leadership behaviour would have a significant relationship with the development of organisational commitment. Previous researches suggest a positive direct relationship between leadership behaviour and organisational commitment.

Transformational leadership is generally associated with desired organisational outcomes such as the willingness of followers to expend extra effort (Bass, 1985). A willingness to expend extra effort indicates some degree of commitment. Contingent reward behaviours that represent transactional leadership have been found to be reasonably associated with performance and work attitudes of followers although at a lower level than transformational leadership behaviours (Nyengane, 2008).

A relationship between commitment and leadership style has been reported in the organisational and management literature. Nyengane (2008) reported a positive relationship between leader support and commitment. In three separate studies, Popper, Mayselless & Castelnovo (as cited in Nyengane, 2008) found evidence to support the hypothesis that a positive correlation existed between transformational leadership and attachment. Kent and Chelladurai (2001) found that individualised consideration has positive correlation with both affective commitment and normative commitment.

Hayward, Goss and Tolmay (2004) also found that transformational leadership has moderate positive correlation with affective commitment. Lower correlation coefficients between transformational leadership and normative, as well as continuance, commitments were found. No correlation was found between transactional leadership and affective, normative and continuance commitment.

According to Walumbwa and Lawler (2003), there is considerable research available suggesting that the transformational leadership style is positively associated with commitment in a variety of organisational settings and cultures. Nyengane (2008) indicated that transformational leaders are able to influence employees' commitment by promoting higher levels of intrinsic value associated with creating a higher level of personal commitment on the part of the leader and followers to a common vision, mission, and organisational goals.

Transformational leaders influence followers' commitment by encouraging them to think critically by using novel approaches, involving followers in decision-making processes and inspiring loyalty while recognizing and appreciating the different needs of each follower to develop his or her personal potential (Nyengane, 2008). By encouraging followers to seek new ways to approach problems and challenges and identifying with followers' needs, transformational leaders are able to motivate their followers to get more involved in their work, resulting in higher levels of commitment (Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003).

A few exceptions, however, were reported; for example, a study conducted by Baloch and Associates (2010) in Pakistan amongst 312 private sector college teachers, indicated that transformational leadership had 31% impact on employees' commitment while transactional leadership 49% on employees' commitment. The result also indicates that the transactional leadership style is a stronger predictor of commitment than transformational leadership style (Nizam & Shah, 2015). Similarly, a study conducted in Malaysia by Lo, Ramayah and Min (2009) concluded that there was a stronger impact on commitment for transactional leadership styles, and that managers may anticipate lesser conflict between supervisors and general employees in organisations when employees' values reflect their culture, indicating a cultural bias to leadership and organisational commitment.

3. Research Methodology

To analyze the relationship between the leadership style and employee performance in Nigerian oil and gas sector, survey research approach was adopted. A sample size of 100 respondents was selected from all staff of the chosen oil and gas companies namely: Lubcon Ltd and Orientry Ltd. Convenience sampling technique was used in the selection of the companies while stratified and then purposive sampling techniques were used to select the respondents. Stratification is used to enable coverage of all and each level of staff. Purposive sampling techniques was used in each stratum to ensure majority of the respondents are knowledgeable in the area of study. Primary source of data was used for the study. The primary source comprised of the questionnaire that was used to elicit required information from the respondents and personal interview with few of the respondents that are willing. Correlations was used to analyze the hypotheses regarding the relationship between the respective leadership styles and each of the performance measures of the employees.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion of Results

Discussion of Results from Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 shows that at Lubcon Ltd., each of the respondents agrees that, on the average, the leadership behaviour is charismatic and inspirationally motivating most of the time (see Appendix A). But while other respondents agree that, on the average, the leadership behaviour also stimulates intellectually and considers followers on individual basis most of the time. Table 2, on the other hand, shows that at Orientry Ltd., each of the respondents agrees that, on the average, the leadership behaviour is charismatic and inspirationally motivating little of the time (see Appendix B). But while other respondents agree that, on the average, the leadership behaviour also stimulates intellectually and considers followers on individual basis little of the time.

Table 3 shows that at Lubcon Ltd., each of the respondents agrees that, on the average, the leadership exhibits constructive or contingent reward behaviour little of the time, and also agrees that, on the average, the behaviour is equally corrective or management by exception (see Appendix C). While table 4 also shows that each of the respondents at Orientry Ltd. agrees that, on the average, the leadership exhibits constructive or contingent reward behaviour most of the time, and also agree that, on the average, the behaviour is equally corrective or management by exception (see Appendix D).

It is evident from table 5 that each of the respondents at Lubcon Ltd. agrees that, on the average, are committed to their job at the company (see Appendix E). It is evident from table 6 that employees at Orientry Ltd. have less commitment to their job with the company as compared to Lubcon Ltd (see Appendix F).

It is equally evident from table 7 that each of the respondents at Lubcon Ltd. agrees that, on the average, have good attitude to their job at the company (see Appendix G). It is equally evident from table 8 that employees at Orientry Ltd. have a better attitude to their job with the company as compared to Lubcon Ltd (see Appendix H).

Analysis of Hypotheses
Hypothesis One

There is no relationship between transactional leadership style and employee commitment in both companies.

Correlations

		TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (LUBCON)	TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (ORIENTRY)	EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (LUBCON)	EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (ORIENTRY)
TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (LUBCON)	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	1 25	.634** 23	.233 .263 25	.160 .466 23
TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (ORIENTRY)	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.634** .001 23	1 23	-.179 .413 23	.111 .613 23
EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (LUBCON)	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.233 .263 25	-.179 .413 23	1 25	-.184 .401 23
EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (ORIENTRY)	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.160 .466 23	.111 .613 23	-.184 .401 23	1 23

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

Source: Research, 2018

The table above shows the correlation coefficient relationship between transactional leadership style and employee commitment in both companies. The values 0.223 and 0.111 show that there are positive relationships between transactional leadership style and employee commitment at Lubcon Ltd and Orientry Ltd respectively. The p-values of 0.263 and 0.613 in the table further signifies that the relationships are not significant at 5% level of significance. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis.

Hypothesis Two

There is no relationship between transactional leadership style and employee attitude to work in both companies.

Correlations

		TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (LUBCON)	TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (ORIENTRY)	ATTITUDE TO WORK (LUBCON)	ATTITUDE TO WORK (ORIENTRY)
TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (LUBCON)	Pearson Correlation	1	.634**	.080	.498*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.703	.015
	N	25	23	25	23
TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (ORIENTRY)	Pearson Correlation	.634**	1	-.057	.914**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.796	.000
	N	23	23	23	23
ATTITUDE TO WORK (LUBCON)	Pearson Correlation	.080	-.057	1	-.095
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.703	.796		.665
	N	25	23	25	23
ATTITUDE TO WORK (ORIENTRY)	Pearson Correlation	.498*	.914**	-.095	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.000	.665	
	N	23	23	23	23

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

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

Source: Research, 2018

The table above shows the correlation coefficient relationship between transactional leadership style and employee commitment in both companies. The values 0.080 and 0.914 show that there are positive relationships between transactional leadership style and employee attitude to work at Lubcon Ltd and Orientry Ltd respectively. The p-values of 0.703 and 0.000 in the table further signifies that the relationship between transactional leadership and attitude in Lubcon Ltd. is not significant at 5% and significant at 1% levels of significance at Orientry Ltd. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis.

Hypothesis Three

There is no relationship between transformational leadership style and employee commitment in both companies.

Correlations

		TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP (LUBCON)	TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP (ORIENTRY)	EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (LUBCON)	EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (ORIENTRY)
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP (LUBCON)	Pearson Correlation	1	.329	.742**	.148
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.125	.000	.499
	N	25	23	25	23
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP (ORIENTRY)	Pearson Correlation	.329	1	.544**	-.094
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125		.007	.668
	N	23	23	23	23
EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (LUBCON)	Pearson Correlation	.742**	.544**	1	-.184
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.007		.401
	N	25	23	25	23
EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (ORIENTRY)	Pearson Correlation	.148	-.094	-.184	1

Sig. (2-tailed)	.499	.668	.401	
N	23	23	23	23

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

Source: Research, 2018

The table above shows the correlation coefficient relationship between transformational leadership style and employee commitment in both companies. The values 0.742 and -0.094 show that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and employee commitment at Lubcon Ltd and a negative relationship between the variables at Orientry Ltd. The p-values of 0.000 and 0.668 in the table further signifies that the relationships are significant at 1% and not significant at 5% levels of significance respectively. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis.

Hypothesis Four

There is no relationship between transformational leadership style and employee attitude to work in both companies.

Correlations

		TRANSFORMATIO NAL LEADERSHIP (LUBCON)	TRANSFORMATIO NAL LEADERSHIP (ORIENTRY)	ATTITUDE TO WORK (LUBCON)	ATTITUDE TO WORK (ORIENTRY)
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP (LUBCON)	Pearson Correlation	1	.329	.536**	-.237
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.125	.006	.277
	N	25	23	25	23
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP (ORIENTRY)	Pearson Correlation	.329	1	.153	.158
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125		.485	.471
	N	23	23	23	23
ATTITUDE TO WORK (LUBCON)	Pearson Correlation	.536**	.153	1	-.095
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.485		.665
	N	25	23	25	23
ATTITUDE TO WORK (ORIENTRY)	Pearson Correlation	-.237	.158	-.095	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.277	.471	.665	
	N	23	23	23	23

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

Source: Research, 2018

The table above shows the correlation coefficient relationship between transformational leadership style and employee commitment in both companies. The values 0.536 and 0.158 show that there are positive relationships between transformational leadership style and employee attitude to work at Lubcon Ltd and Orientry Ltd respectively. The p-values of 0.006 and 0.471 in the table further signifies that the relationships are significant at 1% not significant at 5% levels of significance respectively. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis.

Consequently, it can be concluded that in the petroleum industry, while transformational leadership style has significant positive effect on performance (commitment and attitude) in the firm that adopts it most of the time, the effect of transactional leadership style on performance of the same firm is insignificant. A possible reason for this is that the employees of the firm has an orientation of achieving the strategic objectives of the firm. Also, the firm that adopts transactional leadership style most of the time has a significant effect on performance, while transformational leadership style has an insignificant effect on performance of employees in the same firm. A possible reason for this is that the employees of the firm has an orientation of doing the same routine of task most or all of the time and may be resistant to change. However, this can be, in the long run, unhealthy to the firm.

Therefore, charisma, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation/individual consideration rather than contingent recognition/reward and management by exception consideration could be appropriate leadership behaviours suitable for the oil and gas industry.

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has evaluated the impact of leadership styles on employee performance in selected oil and gas firms. The analysis has shown that each of charisma, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation/individual consideration traits of transformational leadership style exerts positive and significant effect on both commitment and attitude of followers in the firm that adopts it most of the time, and a negative but insignificant effect on the commitment and also a positive but insignificant effect on their attitude in the firm that adopts it less of the time. On the other hand, each trait of transactional leadership style considered in this study, constructive/contingent reward and corrective and management by exception has strong positive and significant positive effect on attitude of employees, and a weak positive and insignificant effect of their commitment in the firm that adopts it most of the time, it also exerts weak positive but insignificant effect on both commitment and attitude of followers in the firm that adopts it little of the time. The study concludes that transformational leadership style is more appropriate in inducing employee performance in oil and gas firms than transactional leadership style.

Consequently, the study recommends that oil and gas firms should adopt transformational leadership style but strategize to migrate to transactional leadership style during crisis and emergency situations.

References

- Abbasialiya, A. (2010). *The concept of Leadership*. Retrieved November 11, 2016, from <http://expertscolumn.com/content/concept-leadership>.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(3), 26-40. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31. Retrieved December 8, 2016, from <http://ezproxy.library.capella.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.library.capella.edu/login.a>
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32. doi:10.1080/135943299398410
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 7(3), 18-40. doi:10.1177/107179190000700302
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207
- Bass, B., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Application*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), pp. 145-179. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00012-0
- Conger, J. A. (2011). Charismatic leadership. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of leadership* (pp. 86-102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Conger, J. A., & Hunt, J. G. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership: Taking stock of the present and future (part i). *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), pp. 121-127. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00017-X
- Diaz-Saenz, H. R. (2011). Transformational leadership. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of leadership* (pp. 299-310). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eid, J., Johnsen, B. H., Bartone, P. T., & Nissestad, O. A. (2008). Growing transformational leaders: Exploring the role of personality hardiness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(1), 4-23.
- Fiedler, F. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 149-190.
- Glynn, M. A., & DeJordy, R. (2010). Leadership through an organizational behavior lens: A look at the last half-century of research. In N. Nohria, & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership and practice* (pp. 119-158). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

- Hambley, L. A., O'Neill, T. A., & Kline, T. J. (2007). Virtual team leadership: The effects of leadership style and communication medium on team interaction styles and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103(1), 1-20.
- Hammady, S., Burdden, A., Evans, C., & Davidson, L. (2014). *Filling the pipeline: How oil and gas leaders can engage, enable and retain technical experts*. United Kingdom: Hay Group.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superior's evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(4), 695-702. Retrieved December 14, 2016, from <http://ezproxy.library.capella.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.library.capella.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=5111775&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Hautala, T. (2006). The relationship between personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(8), 777-794. doi:10.1108/02621710610684259
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.
- Idowu, B. H. (2008). Leader-member exchange and organizational communication satisfaction in multiple contexts. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 39(2), 220-244.
- Ivancevich, J., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. (2007). *Organization Behaviour and Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Jung, D. W. (2008). Towards understanding the direct and indirect effects of CEOs' transformational leadership on firm innovation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), pp. 582-594. doi:10.1016/2008.07.007
- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviour: A study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 135-159.
- Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J. L., Chen, Z., & Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 744-764. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2009.43669971
- Lo, M., Ramayah, T., & Min, H. (2009). Leadership styles and organisational commitment: A test on Malaysia manufacturing industry. *African Journal of Marketing Management*, 1, 133-139.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, pp. 385-425.
- Millet, S. (2012). *Human Communication: Principles and Contexts* (11th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Naylor, J. (1999). *Management*. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.
- Nizam, K., & Shah, F. M. (2015). Impact of employee motivation on organizational performance in oil and gas sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research*, 3(12), 7-15.
- Nyengane, M. (2008). *The relationship between leadership style and employee commitment: An exploratory study in an electricity utility of South Africa*. Rhodes University, South Africa, Business Administration. (n.p.): (n.p.).
- Olembo, D., & Karugu, O. (2010). *Key Issues in Organizational Communication*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 1(1), 91-110. doi:10.1177/107179199300100109
- Sadeghi, A., & Pihie, Z. A. (2012). Transformational leadership and its predictive effects on leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 186-197.
- Saeed, R., Mussawar, S., Lodhi, R. N., Iqbal, A., Nayab, H. H., & Yaseen, S. (2013). Factors affecting the performance of employees at work place in the banking sector of Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 17(9), 1200-1208. doi:DOI: 10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.17.09.12256
- Singh, N., & Krishnan, V. R. (2008). Self-sacrifice and transformational leadership: Mediating role of altruism. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(3), 261-274.
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building effective organizations: transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes, and withdrawal behaviors in three emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1083-1105.
- Wehrich, H. C., & Koontz, H. (2008). *Management* (12th ed.). New Delhi: McGraw Hill.
- Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 6-16.
- Zhu, W., Sosik, J. J., Riggio, R. E., & Yang, B. (2012). Relationships between transformational and active transactional leadership and followers' organizational identification: The role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 13(3), 186-194.

APPENDIX A

Responses on Leadership Behaviour -Transformational Leadership Style (Orientry Ltd)

	CHARISMA						INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION						INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION						IAV
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	AV	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	AV	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	AV	
R1	3	4	5	4	3	3.8	5	1	5	3	4	3.6	2	3	5	4	1	3.0	3.5
R2	4	5	4	3	5	4.2	1	5	3	4	2	3.0	3	5	4	1	3	3.2	3.5
R3	5	4	3	5	1	3.6	5	3	4	2	3	3.4	5	4	1	3	4	3.4	3.5
R4	4	3	5	1	5	3.6	3	4	2	3	5	3.4	4	1	3	4	5	3.4	3.5
R5	3	5	1	5	3	3.4	4	2	3	5	4	3.6	1	3	4	5	4	3.4	3.5
R6	5	1	5	3	4	3.6	2	3	5	4	1	3.0	3	4	5	4	3	3.8	3.5
R7	1	5	3	4	2	3.0	3	5	4	3	3	3.6	4	5	4	3	1	3.4	3.3
R8	5	3	4	2	3	3.4	5	4	4	3	4	4.0	5	4	3	1	5	3.6	3.7
R9	3	4	2	3	5	3.4	4	1	3	4	5	3.4	4	3	1	5	3	3.2	3.3
R10	4	2	3	5	4	3.6	1	3	4	5	4	3.4	3	1	5	3	4	3.2	3.4
R11	2	3	5	4	5	3.8	3	4	5	4	3	3.8	1	5	3	4	2	3.0	3.5
R12	3	5	4	5	3	4.0	4	5	4	3	4	4.0	5	3	4	2	3	3.4	3.8
R13	5	4	5	3	4	4.2	5	4	3	4	5	4.2	3	4	2	3	5	3.4	3.9
R14	4	5	3	4	5	4.2	4	3	4	5	3	3.8	4	2	3	5	4	3.6	3.9
R15	5	3	4	5	4	4.2	3	4	5	3	4	3.8	2	3	5	4	1	3.0	3.7
R16	3	5	4	5	3	4.0	4	2	3	5	4	3.6	1	3	4	5	4	3.4	3.7
R17	5	4	5	3	4	4.2	2	3	5	4	4	3.6	3	4	5	4	3	3.8	3.9
R18	4	5	3	4	2	3.6	3	5	4	4	5	4.2	4	5	4	3	1	3.4	3.7
R19	5	3	4	2	3	3.4	5	4	3	3	4	3.8	5	4	3	1	5	3.6	3.6
R20	3	4	2	3	5	3.4	4	5	3	4	5	4.2	4	3	1	5	3	3.2	3.6
R21	4	2	3	5	4	3.6	4	3	4	5	4	4.0	3	1	5	3	4	3.2	3.6
R22	2	3	5	4	1	3.0	3	4	5	4	3	3.8	1	5	3	4	2	3.0	3.3
R23	3	4	5	4	3	3.8	5	5	5	3	4	4.4	2	3	5	4	1	3.0	3.7
R24	4	5	4	3	5	4.2	4	5	3	4	2	3.6	3	5	4	1	3	3.2	3.7
R25	5	4	3	5	3	4.0	5	3	4	2	3	3.4	5	4	1	3	5	3.6	3.7

Source: Field Survey, 2018

APPENDIX B

Responses on Leadership Behaviour -Transformational Leadership Style (Orientry Ltd)

	CHARISMA						INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION						INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION						IAV
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	AV	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	AV	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	AV	
R1	3	2	4	4	2	3.0	5	1	3	3	4	3.2	2	3	2	4	4	3	3.1
R2	3	5	2	3	2	3.0	5	2	3	4	2	3.2	3	2	4	4	3	3.2	3.1
R3	5	4	3	2	1	3.0	2	3	4	5	3	3.4	1	4	5	3	4	3.4	3.3
R4	2	3	4	1	3	2.6	3	4	2	3	5	3.4	4	2	3	2	5	3.2	3.1
R5	3	3	1	4	2	2.6	2	4	3	5	4	3.6	1	3	3	5	2	2.8	3.0
R6	3	1	4	2	3	2.6	4	3	3	4	1	3	3	4	4	4	3	3.6	3.1
R7	1	2	3	4	2	2.4	3	2	4	5	3	3.4	4	1	4	3	5	3.4	3.1
R8	1	3	4	2	3	2.6	3	2	5	3	4	3.4	1	4	3	5	2	3	3.0
R9	3	4	2	3	2	2.8	2	1	3	3	4	2.6	4	3	1	2	3	2.6	2.7
R10	2	2	3	2	4	2.6	1	3	2	3	3	2.4	1	2	5	2	3	2.6	2.5
R11	2	2	3	2	1	2.0	3	4	2	4	3	3.2	1	5	2	4	2	2.8	2.7
R12	3	2	3	1	3	2.4	4	1	4	3	1	2.6	5	2	1	2	3	2.6	2.5
R13	5	4	1	3	4	3.4	5	2	3	5	2	3.4	3	4	5	3	2	3.4	3.4
R14	2	4	3	2	5	3.2	1	3	1	5	3	2.6	4	1	3	2	4	2.8	2.9
R15	1	3	2	5	3	2.8	3	5	5	3	4	4	2	3	2	3	5	3	3.3
R16	3	5	1	2	3	2.8	3	2	3	1	4	2.6	1	3	3	2	4	2.6	2.7
R17	5	4	5	3	4	4.2	2	3	2	4	1	2.4	3	4	5	4	3	3.8	3.5
R18	1	2	3	4	2	2.4	3	2	4	4	3	3.2	4	5	4	3	5	4.2	3.3
R19	1	3	4	2	5	3.0	3	4	4	2	4	3.4	2	4	3	5	5	3.8	3.4
R20	3	4	2	3	4	3.2	1	1	3	2	3	2.0	4	3	5	2	3	3.4	2.9
R21	1	2	3	5	4	3.0	5	3	2	5	5	4.0	3	1	2	3	5	2.8	3.3
R22	2	3	3	2	1	2.2	3	4	5	1	2	3.0	1	2	3	4	2	2.4	2.5
R23	3	4	2	3	3	3.0	2	1	6	3	4	3.2	2	1	2	4	1	2.0	2.7

Source: Field Survey, 2018

APPENDIX C

Responses on Leadership behaviour - Transactional Leadership Style (Lubcon Ltd)

	CONSTRUCTIVE/CONTINGENT REWARD						CORRECTIVE/MANAGEMENT BY EXCEPTION						IAV
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	AV	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	AV	
R1	2	3	4	3	4	3.2	2	1	4	3	2	2.4	2.8
R2	3	4	3	4	2	3.2	1	5	4	2	3	3.0	3.1
R3	4	3	4	2	1	2.8	5	4	2	3	4	3.6	3.2
R4	3	4	2	1	5	3.0	4	3	3	4	3	3.4	3.2
R5	4	2	1	5	4	3.2	2	3	4	3	4	3.2	3.2
R6	2	1	5	4	2	2.8	3	4	3	4	2	3.2	3.0
R7	1	5	4	2	3	3.0	4	3	4	2	1	2.8	2.9
R8	5	4	2	3	4	3.6	3	4	2	1	4	2.8	3.2
R9	1	2	3	4	3	2.6	4	2	1	4	2	2.6	2.6
R10	1	3	4	3	4	3.0	2	1	4	2	3	2.4	2.7
R11	2	4	3	4	2	3.0	1	4	2	3	4	2.8	2.9
R12	3	3	4	2	1	2.6	4	2	3	4	3	3.2	2.9
R13	4	4	2	1	4	3.0	2	3	4	3	4	3.2	3.1
R14	2	2	5	1	4	2.8	3	2	4	3	4	3.2	3.0
R15	3	5	1	4	3	3.2	2	4	3	4	5	3.6	3.4
R16	2	1	4	3	2	2.4	4	3	4	5	1	3.4	2.9
R17	2	4	3	2	4	3.0	3	4	5	1	4	3.4	3.2
R18	1	3	2	4	3	2.6	4	5	1	4	3	3.4	3.0
R19	3	2	4	3	4	3.2	5	1	4	3	2	3.0	3.1
R20	4	4	3	4	5	4.0	1	4	3	2	4	2.8	3.4
R21	2	3	4	5	1	3.0	4	3	2	4	3	3.2	3.1
R22	5	4	5	1	4	3.8	3	2	4	3	4	3.2	3.5
R23	3	5	1	4	3	3.2	2	4	3	4	5	3.6	3.4
R24	2	1	4	3	2	2.4	4	3	4	5	1	3.4	2.9
R25	1	4	3	2	4	2.8	3	4	5	1	4	3.4	3.1

Source: Field Survey, 2018

APPENDIX D

Responses on Leadership Behaviour - Transactional Leadership Style (Orientry Ltd)

	CONSTRUCTIVE/CONTINGENT REWARD							CORRECTIVE/MANAGEMENT BY EXCEPTION						IAV
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	AV	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	AV		
R1	4	3	4	5	4	4.00	2	5	4	3	2	3.2	3.6	
R2	5	4	3	4	2	3.60	4	5	4	2	3	3.6	3.6	
R3	4	3	4	5	1	3.40	5	4	5	3	4	4.2	3.8	
R4	3	4	2	5	5	3.80	4	3	3	4	3	3.4	3.6	
R5	4	2	3	5	4	3.60	4	3	5	4	4	4.0	3.8	
R6	2	3	5	4	2	3.20	5	4	3	4	4	4.0	3.6	
R7	5	5	4	2	3	3.80	4	3	4	4	5	4.0	3.9	
R8	5	4	2	3	4	3.60	3	4	5	4	4	4.0	3.8	
R9	5	4	3	4	3	3.80	4	5	4	4	2	3.8	3.8	
R10	4	3	4	3	4	3.60	2	5	4	2	3	3.2	3.4	
R11	5	4	3	4	2	3.60	5	4	2	3	4	3.6	3.6	
R12	3	3	4	5	1	3.20	4	4	3	4	3	3.6	3.4	
R13	4	4	4	3	4	3.80	3	5	4	4	4	4.0	3.9	
R14	2	2	5	3	4	3.20	3	2	4	3	4	3.2	3.2	
R15	3	5	4	4	3	3.80	5	4	3	4	5	4.2	4.0	
R16	2	5	4	3	2	3.20	4	4	4	5	1	3.6	3.4	
R17	4	4	3	4	4	3.80	3	4	5	3	4	3.8	3.8	
R18	5	3	2	4	3	3.40	4	5	4	4	3	4.0	3.7	
R19	3	4	4	3	4	3.60	5	5	4	3	2	3.8	3.7	
R20	4	4	5	4	5	4.40	1	4	3	5	4	3.4	3.9	
R21	5	3	4	5	1	3.60	4	3	5	4	3	3.8	3.7	
R22	5	4	5	5	4	4.60	3	5	4	3	4	3.8	4.2	
R23	3	5	5	4	3	4.00	4	4	3	4	5	4.0	4.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2018

APPENDIX E

Responses on Performance – Employee Commitment (Lubcon Ltd)

	COMMITMENT					AV
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	
R1	4	4	5	5	4	4.4
R2	5	4	4	4	5	4.4
R3	5	3	5	4	5	4.4
R4	4	5	5	4	4	4.4
R5	4	5	5	4	4	4.4
R6	5	4	5	3	5	4.4
R7	5	4	3	4	3	3.8
R8	3	5	4	5	5	4.4
R9	3	4	3	5	4	3.8
R10	4	5	5	4	3	4.2
R11	2	4	5	5	3	3.8
R12	5	3	5	4	4	4.2
R13	4	5	5	5	5	4.8
R14	4	5	5	4	5	4.6
R15	5	5	3	4	5	4.4
R16	4	5	3	4	5	4.2
R17	4	5	4	5	5	4.6
R18	5	4	5	4	4	4.4
R19	4	4	5	4	4	4.2
R20	5	3	4	5	4	4.2
R21	5	2	5	4	5	4.2
R22	5	2	4	3	5	3.8
R23	4	5	4	4	5	4.4
R24	5	3	4	5	5	4.4
R25	4	4	4	5	5	4.4

Source: Field Survey, 2018

APPENDIX F

Responses on Performance – Employee Commitment (Orientry Ltd)

	COMMITMENT					AV
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	
R1	4	1	2	3	4	2.8
R2	3	3	2	4	2	2.8
R3	3	2	4	3	3	3.0
R4	2	4	1	3	4	2.8
R5	1	4	2	3	4	2.8
R6	4	3	3	2	3	3.0
R7	1	3	2	5	4	3.0
R8	4	1	5	3	2	3.0
R9	3	4	2	1	5	3.0
R10	3	4	5	2	2	3.2
R11	2	5	4	3	2	3.2
R12	4	2	4	3	2	3.0
R13	1	5	3	2	4	3.0
R14	3	4	5	2	2	3.2
R15	2	4	3	4	5	3.6
R16	4	2	4	3	4	3.4
R17	2	4	3	4	2	3.0
R18	2	5	4	3	4	3.6
R19	4	2	3	2	5	3.2
R20	3	2	5	2	4	3.2
R21	4	2	4	2	3	3.0
R22	4	2	5	1	5	3.4
R23	3	2	4	4	2	3.0

Source: Field Survey, 2018

APPENDIX G

Table 7: Responses on Performance – Attitude to Work (Lubcon Ltd)

	ATTITUDE TO WORK					
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	AV
R1	4	5	3	3	4	3.8
R2	5	3	2	4	5	3.8
R3	3	5	4	4	3	3.8
R4	4	4	4	5	2	3.8
R5	4	4	2	4	5	3.8
R6	4	4	3	3	5	3.8
R7	4	3	4	3	4	3.6
R8	4	3	5	3	5	4.0
R9	3	4	4	4	3	3.6
R10	3	4	5	3	5	4.0
R11	2	4	4	3	5	3.6
R12	4	4	5	3	4	4.0
R13	5	5	3	5	4	4.4
R14	3	4	5	5	4	4.2
R15	5	3	3	4	5	4.0
R16	4	2	5	4	4	3.8
R17	5	4	3	5	4	4.2
R18	3	4	4	3	5	3.8
R19	4	2	5	5	4	4.0
R20	3	1	5	2	4	3.0
R21	4	5	4	1	5	3.8
R22	4	3	3	5	5	4.0
R23	3	5	4	4	5	4.2
R24	5	5	4	2	4	4.0
R25	5	4	3	4	4	4.0

Source: Field Survey, 2018

APPENDIX H

Table 8: Responses on Performance – Employee Commitment (Orientry Ltd)

	ATTITUDE TO WORK					
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	AV
R1	3	4	5	3	4	3.8
R2	5	2	5	5	2	3.8
R3	5	4	5	4	3	4.2
R4	4	5	3	4	3	3.8
R5	2	5	3	5	4	3.8
R6	4	4	4	4	3	3.8
R7	4	5	3	5	5	4.4
R8	3	3	5	4	5	4.0
R9	5	4	4	4	4	4.2
R10	3	4	5	4	3	3.8
R11	2	4	4	5	4	3.8
R12	5	3	3	5	2	3.6
R13	4	5	5	3	5	4.4
R14	3	4	5	3	2	3.4
R15	5	5	3	4	5	4.4
R16	1	5	3	4	5	3.6
R17	3	4	5	4	5	4.2
R18	3	4	3	5	4	3.8
R19	3	3	5	4	4	3.8
R20	3	5	4	5	5	4.4
R21	5	3	5	4	3	4.0
R22	5	5	4	4	5	4.6
R23	3	5	4	4	5	4.2

Source: Field Survey, 2018